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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: GENDER AND COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

"...the likelihood that a woman will perform the tasks of a leader is great, but the likelihood of her being called a leader is not" (Morgan 218).

Problem

In "Women as Emergent Leaders in Student Collaborative Writing Groups," Meg Morgan reveals that women as leaders in mixed gender groups are not recognized. In accordance with Morgan’s assertion, I assert that women leaders have not been recognized in small groups. The question I ask is why? The lack of leader recognition is a problem because any person who performs leadership duties should be recognized for her contributions to leadership. In response to this issue, I pose the following general questions: How can leaders be given the recognition they deserve? Does gender influence the way male and female leaders are viewed? While Morgan describes leadership emergence in written task groups, I inquire about leadership emergence in oral task groups. More specifically, I explore the relationship of gender to speech patterns of small group members engaged in a task.

In this chapter, I discuss my approach to exploring leader emergence in small group interaction and the development of my specific research question.
Approach

I approach my exploration of leadership in small group interaction by reviewing gender studies. I inquire whether or not gender influences the way male and female leaders are viewed. There are two reasons that I explore gender in relation to speech patterns for leadership in small groups: (1) gender research includes a description of speech behaviors characterized by some researchers as "female" (Chodorow 1974; Kalcik 1975; Jenkins and Kramer 1978; Fishman 1978; Gilligan 1982; Maltz and Borker 1982; Harding 1984; Lay 1989; Lorraine 1990); and (2) gender research relates to the issue of recognition because some gender research labels male and female speech in terms of dominance or powerlessness (Bales 1950; Lakoff 1975; Wetzel 1988; Singh and Lele 1990; Tannen 1990). Speech characterized as "powerless" is less likely to be recognized as a characteristic of leadership since traditional views of leadership include "dominant" speech characteristics (Barge 194).

Reviewing descriptions of male and female speech behavior helps understand labels of dominance or powerlessness that have been attached to male and female language. Many gender studies categorize female speech skills as relationship-oriented (Chodorow 1974; Kalcik 1975; Jenkins and Kramer 1978; Fishman 1978; Gilligan 1982; Maltz and Borker 1982; Harding 1984; Lay 1989; Lorraine 1990) and male speech behaviors as task-oriented (Aries 1976; Baird 1976; Lockheed and Hall 1979; Maltz and Borker 1982). Relational speech has been described as "connected knowing" and "web-making" in which understanding all members' views enriches communication (Lay 7). Some researchers suggest that females find worth and self-identity through relationships and collaboration (Lay 7), while others suggest that interpersonal,
relational behaviors are signs of weakness and indicate powerlessness in women (Lakoff 1975; Wetzel 1988; Singh and Lele 1990). Conversely, some researchers report that men display "dominance" in conversation by monopolizing the conversational floor (Eakins and Eakins 1976; Edelsky 1981; Arliss 1991). Labels of dominance have often been attached to interruption and amount of talk (including turn-taking and topic control). Men have been reported to speak more often and for longer periods of time (Eakins and Eakins, 1976; Graddol and Swan, 1989; Lockheed and Hall, 1979). Several studies also report that men interrupt others more often than women interrupt others (West and Zimmerman, 1975, 1983; Tannen 1990); however, not all agree that interruptions are a measure of dominance (Dindia 1987; Tannen 1993).

While the above studies report specific differences in language used by men and women, gender differences have also been described in terms of "self" and "voice." Terms like self and voice illuminate a contrast in male and female use of language. For example, Sandra Harding adopts the belief that gender shapes personality formation and reports that women and men have some general differences in personality due to gender:

A rational person, for women, values highly her abilities to empathize and "connect" with particular others and wants to learn more complex and satisfying ways to take the role of the particular other in relationships. ... For men, in contrast, a rational person values highly his ability to separate himself from others and to make decisions independent of what others think—to develop "autonomy." And he wants to learn more complex and satisfying ways to take the role of the generalized other (Harding 1982, 53-54 qtd in Tamsin Lorraine's Gender, Identity and the Production of Meaning 18).

Similarly, Tamsin Lorraine reports that contrasting a "feminine, relational point of view that emphasizes empathy and connectedness to a masculine,
oppositional point of view that emphasizes autonomy and separation" (19) is reported often in gender literature and largely contributes to the idea of a "feminist standpoint"—that is, a distinctively feminine experience, a perspective that posits an alternative theory of knowledge to go with it" (19). Knowledge in the feminist perspective is represented not only by "knowing different things" but knowing them in a different way (Lorraine 19). Psychologist Carol Gilligan proposes in her 1982 book, *In a Different Voice*, that stereotypical differences in the ways men and women communicate are due to the way they were taught as children. Gilligan discusses the psychological background of children and suggests that men are raised to be independent while women are raised to be "connectors" and relationship builders.

While gender differences that the above sources describe in terms of "self" and "voice" provide interesting perspectives, I question whether or not gender research has influenced the views of male and female leadership. In some gender and communication studies, male task behaviors have been labeled "dominant" whereas female relational skills have been labeled "powerless" and consequently receive lesser value. As I mentioned earlier, speech characterized as "powerless" is unlikely to be recognized as a characteristic of leadership since traditional views of leadership include "dominant" speech characteristics (Barge 194). Many women may not be recognized as leaders because, as some gender research reports, values of powerlessness have been attached to female speech behaviors. Those who use "powerless" speech may not be recognized as leaders.

In response to viewing leadership as male, several leadership studies have debated the difference in leadership styles of men and women (Eagly and Johnson 1990; Jenkins 1980; Morgan 1994; Ragins and Sundstrom 1989). While
some argue that men have more competitive leadership styles and women have more interpersonal leadership styles, others argue that there are no differences between male and female leaders (Jenkins 1980; Bem 1982). Discrepancies may be due to the different types of data used by researchers (for example, using data from academic versus professional settings) (Eagly and Johnson 233). In response to these studies, I inquire about the appropriateness of using gender to label, define, or describe leadership. In terms of collaborative leadership, for example, I believe that leadership depends more on the use of relational behaviors in group interaction rather than on gender.

What are relational behaviors?

I narrow my study of gender and speech patterns to relational behaviors that have been described as "female" in some gender research (Chodorow 1974; Kalcik 1975; Lakoff 1975; Aries 1976; Baird 1976; Fishman 1978; Gilligan 1982; Maltz and Borker 1982; Lorraine 1990; Tannen 1990). I refer to "relational" speech behaviors as interpersonal speech behaviors that demonstrate a concern for other members in a group. Although some research that labels female speech behavior (including relational behavior) as "powerless" (Lakoff 1975; Wetzel 1988; Singh and Lele 1990), other research suggests that relational behaviors are valued for creating an open discussion environment in small groups (Kalcik 1975; Jenkins and Kramer 1978; Lay 1989) and empowering group members to speak (Valentine 1986; Lamb 1991). In this study I refer to relational behaviors as valuable for small group interaction.

The most helpful example of relational behaviors can be found in research that describes communication in consciousness-raising (CR) groups and
collaborative floors of discussion. In CR groups, relational behaviors are valued for creating an open discussion floor. Because relational behaviors are used in these contexts, CR groups and collaborative discussion floors must be understood before defining relational behaviors. The floor in conversation is defined by Edelsky in her 1981 study "Who's got the floor?" as the "acknowledged 'what's going-on' within a psychological time or space" (Edelsky 384). Edelsky's study is helpful not only for defining conversational floor but also for describing two types of conversational floors. The two floors she describes are "singly developed floors (F1)" and "collaboratively developed floors (F2)" (Edelsky 415). In a singly developed floor of conversation, an individual speaker holds the conversational floor whereas in a collaboratively developed floor, several speakers share the conversational floor. In relation to collaboration, F2 floors could be viewed as more conducive to group work than F1 floors because they encourage input from all group members and invite a variety of ideas to be included in discussion.

It could also be argued that F2 floors diminish dominance (typically associated with males) in conversation. However, the relation of gender to the development of collaborative floors remains an issue. Edelsky found in her study that of the two types of conversational floors (F1 and F2), men participated in more F1 floors than F2 floors, and women used a broader range of functions in speech in both F1 and F2 floors (Edelsky 415-417). Edelsky's study found that collaborative floors of conversation are more likely to be associated with females than males. Regardless of research that connects collaborative conversation to women, I draw attention to research that associates collaborative floors and relational behaviors with women simply because such research exemplifies the use of relational behaviors.
Speech behaviors in egalitarian, open, F2, collaborative environments have been described in CR groups (Kalcik 1975; Jenkins and Kramer 1978) and resemble relational behavior. Consciousness-raising groups have been known to encourage participation of all members in an environment that is supposedly free of dominance or authority. The characteristics of consciousness-raising groups have been associated with female speech qualities of self-disclosure, equal participation in the absence of authority, and the sharing of narratives or stories. CR groups use both F1 and F2 floors as members are encouraged to share their personal experiences or stories (F1) and yet build upon each other's ideas to discuss similar interests (F2). I propose that speech behavior in CR groups models relational behavior in small groups. The use of relational behaviors in CR groups creates an egalitarian environment and in turn diminishes domination.

Susan Kalcik's description of speech behavior in CR groups provides helpful foregrounding for understanding the usefulness of relational behavior in collaborative, encouraging group environments. Kalcik reveals that in CR groups women build on each other's experiences using the following strategies: politeness rules such as apologies; one at a time speaking turns; interruptions in the form of questions; competition in big groups versus support in small groups; humor used to strengthen the group; unfinished stories (like kernel stories); tying new points to discussion; and group production of a story. Kalcik is noted for her definition of the "kernel" story, which is a "nugget" of a story that can be expanded on and that has an emergent structure dependent upon comments or nuggets offered earlier in conversation by other group members.¹

¹Kalcik advocates that kernel stories can be considered a separate genre because conversation becomes part of the story and is structured in part by the social context around it. The concept of
Kalcik's list of communication strategies describes relational behavior in group interaction. The strategies she names, though they are not what I use for my study of eight student small groups, create and exemplify the use of relational behaviors for collaborative discussion in which members interact and build upon each others' ideas. The kernel story is a prime example of this building since it invites members to participate and refer back to previous conversation.

Though relational behavior has often been described as female speech behavior, I do not take the position that relational behavior is displayed exclusively or even primarily by females. Rather, I use research that describes female speech to exemplify relational behavior. Furthermore, I see the possibility that relational behavior is used by and is useful for both males and females in a collaboratively established environment. Specific to this study, I see the possibility that not only may both men and women use relational behaviors, but the use of relational behaviors may create a type of collaborative leadership in small groups.

**Research question**

In response to studies that discuss the importance of relational behaviors for group interaction, I ask whether or not relational behaviors have value specifically for student small group interaction. Does the use of relational behaviors open the floor of conversation in small groups and empower students to voice their opinions? Furthermore, can the use of relational behaviors not only empower students to voice their opinions in an open discussion floor but
also yield a type of collaborative leadership that is constructed through the shared use of relational behaviors? The above inquiries led me to develop the following research question: How do relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership? If the use of relational behaviors empowers students to voice their opinions, then those who use relational behaviors become empowered. If the use of relational behaviors creates a type of collaborative leadership, then those women and men using them can be recognized as leaders.

**What is collaborative leadership?**

Collaborative leadership is a cooperative style of leadership that is constructed by the shared use of relational behaviors in small group interaction. A shared use of behaviors requires that more than one member display relational behaviors in interaction. Because relational behaviors are often displayed by more than one member, the resulting leadership is shared and even built or developed among group members. This view of leadership as shared differs from the traditional view of leadership that may assign the role of emergent leader to one or more persons; in contrast, I assert that collaborative leadership is constructed and shared through relational behaviors in interaction.

In general, collaborative leadership can create an encouraging environment in which members feel free to contribute to discussion. This type of leadership could be labeled "democratic," for relational or webbing behaviors demonstrated by one or more group member(s) display a concern for others' opinions and invite participation of all members. Inviting other group members to participate through the use of relational behaviors distributes the
conversational turns among group members and consequently allows decisions and actions to be made by the group rather than by one person.

Therefore, I define collaborative leadership as the following: (1) collaborative leadership is a cooperative style of leadership; (2) collaborative leadership relies on the use of relational behaviors; and (3) collaborative leadership opens the floor of conversation to all members. This style of leadership could be associated most often with female speech patterns since communication research has identified female speech as cooperative, interpersonal, and egalitarian (Chodorow 1974; Bem 1975; Kalcik 1975; Gilligan 1980; Goodwin 1980; Maltz and Borker 1982; Jenkins and Kramer 1988).

Collaborative leadership relies upon a set of relational speech behaviors that have been characterized as female in some research. However, while several studies on gender and language have categorized male speech as task-oriented and female speech as relationship-oriented (Bales 1950; Baird 1976; Lakoff 1976; Gilligan 1982; Maltz and Borker 1982; Tannen 1990), other studies have suggested that this categorization may not be accurate or sufficient to describe male and female language and that language must be viewed in context (Bem 1975; McMillan et al. 1977; Jenkins and Kramer 1978; Bem 1983; Smeltzer and Werbel 1986; Lay 1989; Tebeaux 1990; Tannen 1993).

Despite the multiple views that are present in gender communication research, I have found through studying small group interaction that certain categorical patterns of relational behaviors (to be defined specifically later) are used frequently by several members within a group, both males and females. This caused me to question the function of relational behaviors in groups and to
explore my research question about ways in which relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership in small group interaction.

To address my research question, I explore three issues in my study and observation of eight student groups: (1) whether or not relational behaviors exist in student small group interaction; (2) whether or not relational behaviors are used more by women than by men; and (3) whether or not the use of relational behaviors contributes to an open discussion environment and, in turn, contributes to a collaborative style of leadership in student small groups. If the use of relational behaviors exists in small groups, and if the use of relational behaviors contributes to a collaborative style of leadership, then those who use the behaviors deserve recognition for contributing to leadership. While a collaborative style of leadership relies upon behaviors that have been characterized as female in some research, this study reveals that relational behaviors used by both men and women yield a type of leadership that is built and shared among group members.

I approach my analysis of collaborative leadership first by reviewing literature about male and female communication differences from disciplines such as speech communication, sociolinguistics, psychology, small group communication, composition pedagogy, collaboration, and professional communication. Second, I explore data I have collected from small group task sessions in two English 105 composition classes. Most of my thesis is dedicated to using a coding scheme to analyze transcripts of eight task groups from English 105. Finally, I discuss the data results of this study as they relate to relational behaviors in gender and leadership.
In the next chapter I discuss male and female speech descriptions in order to further understand how previous research has distinguished between male and female speech behavior. I propose that male and female speech behaviors be appreciated equally, and I advocate the usefulness of relational behaviors for collaborative leadership.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW: GENDER VOICES

In the effort to define female and male speech behaviors, research in speech, composition, psychology, and professional communication has used the term "voice" to describe communication behaviors. Voice has been described as the medium through which we declare ourselves and are heard. The word "voice" has also been represented in literature as meaning the courage to speak and be given credit for our ideas, our lives, and our thoughts. Since male voices have been dominant, female voices have struggled to be heard and valued as important in conversation. Because male and female voices have been assigned different values, the labels attached to male and female language must be questioned if they are to describe the importance of certain behaviors such as relational behaviors that are traditionally defined as female.

My argument that male and female speech have different values is based on my premise that women's voices have not been heard, first because women have not felt encouraged, empowered, or comfortable to articulate them (Lakoff 1978; Gilligan 1982; Flynn 1988). Second, our culture has traditionally assigned greater value to the language of men because male language has been associated with achievement, individuality, success—values that underlie the work ethic and the need to succeed in our culture (Baird 1976; Sattel 1982). The voices of women have been recognized as different than those of men but have not been given equal value. Becoming aware of how men and women use language draws attention to a value hierarchy (language of men valued more than
language of women) and is the first step toward changing our interaction with others to allow all voices to be heard. In particular, becoming aware of relational behaviors—documented female speech behaviors in conversation—as an effective leadership quality has the potential to reduce the value hierarchy and to allow both female and male voices to be heard.

Based on literature that discusses relational behaviors as interpersonal, I further define relational behaviors as those that create cohesiveness and solidarity among group members and allow all members the opportunity to contribute to a group. When relational behaviors have been previously labeled as female, the behaviors have not been considered important or essential communication skills in group interaction (Morgan 1994; Lay 1989; Barge 1994). The failure to assign importance to relational behaviors causes me to investigate the value of relational behaviors in small group interaction for leadership. The frequent occurrence of relational behaviors in small groups observed for this study leads me to believe that these behaviors have value for group interaction and that they are useful leadership communication skills.

In exploring the argument that relational behaviors have value for small group interaction, I discuss the following questions. In exploring my primary research question about ways in which relational behaviors contribute to leadership in group interaction, I have raised additional questions: "Why have relational behaviors been assigned lesser value than behaviors labeled 'dominant'?" "Are only women using these relational behaviors?"

In this chapter, I review literature that discusses differences in male and female communication and the values that have been attached to the language they use. Second, I review literature that describes the use of relational
behaviors in small groups and that advocates the use of male and female speech skills (androgy) as effective communication. I conclude the review of literature with a discussion of the implications of relational behaviors for collaborative activities in pedagogy. This discussion establishes the foundation for introducing and explaining my study of relational behaviors for collaborative leadership in eight student groups that is described and discussed in the remaining chapters.

Values of male and female communication behaviors

Much research on gender and communication differences involves a discussion of hierarchical power, and some research in speech communication describes male and female speech behaviors in dichotomous "power" or "powerless" categories. Male speech has been associated with "power" and "dominance" and has been described as verbal, confident, independent, and aggressive (Aries 1976; Baird 1976). Labels of dominance have often been attached to male speech features such as interruption and amount of talk (including turn-taking and topic control). For example, men have been reported to speak more often and for longer periods of time than women (Swacker 1975; Eakins and Eakins, 1976; Lockheed and Hall, 1979). Several studies also report that men interrupt others more often than women interrupt others (West and Zimmerman, 1975, 1983; Tannen, 1990).

Conversely, powerless speech is described as having hedges, intensifiers, hesitations, polite language, tag questions—features often found in women's speech. Because these speech characteristics have been labeled "powerless," it comes as no surprise that those who use them are not seen as persons who have
power. "Powerful speech is absent [of] any of these features. Overall, individuals using powerful speech tend to be viewed as more competent than those who use powerless speech" (Barge 198).

Robin Lakoff's book *Language and Woman's Place* (1975) drew attention to the female use of powerless speech, hypothesizing that women's use of questions and other features signaled powerlessness and inferiority to men. In response to Lakoff's controversial claims that "women's language" (Lakoff 23) signaled submissiveness and discrimination of women, other studies have measured the use of questions, hedges, fillers, intensifiers, and other features that Lakoff asserted indicated powerless speech.

Particular attention has been paid to the use of questions in conversation. Lakoff hypothesized that tag questions (e.g., "You would like to do this, wouldn't you?") were used most often by women and indicated an inferior position in conversation. Questions have since then been described in more positive terms. Pamela Fishman (1978, 1980) found in her analyses of questions that women ask more questions than men do and that questions women ask serve the function of maintaining conversation. McMillan and her colleagues (1977) concluded that tag questions were used by women to create an interpersonal or relational closeness by prompting other group members to respond and participate in group conversation.

The use of questions as a relational behavior has not always been interpreted as a signal of "powerlessness." While many studies discuss the use of tag questions by females, others find that tag questions are used more often by men than women (Dubois and Crouch 1975; Baumann 1979). Further studies have probed the usefulness of questions in conversation and, in particular,
meetings (Swacker 1976; Johnson 1980). For example, Johnson argues that the use and variety of questions cannot be based on sex, "nor does it demonstrate powerlessness, but is linked instead to the purpose and intent of the speaker" (74).

Despite the findings of some studies that emphasize purpose and intent rather than the gender of the speaker, some past speech communication studies, much like Lakoff's claims, also attribute relational behavior to women in terms that indicate "weakness." Women have been reported to be more "emotionally supportive," "less verbose," "noncompetitive," and more "dependent" in groups (Aries 1976; Baird 1976). However, while these qualities may be seen as powerless in mixed-sex groups, in all-female groups they take on a more positive value. For example, women may be "more vocal" in female groups than in mixed-sex groups. In all-female groups, relational or "webbing" behaviors have been described as establishing an egalitarian environment preferred by women. Some have argued that creating interpersonal "webs" forms a "connected knowing" in which understanding all group members enriches communication (Lay 7; Chodorow 1974).

The creation of "connected knowing" or interpersonal "webs" in all-female groups requires the presence of relational behaviors that I assert are essential to collaborative leadership. Therefore, the need to understand relational behaviors merits further explanation of behaviors displayed in all-female groups. While female behavior in all-female groups has been described as interpersonal, female groups have also been described as having positive, cooperative group environments. Such an the environment is the goal of collaborative leadership.
The presence of an egalitarian, cooperative group environment among females has been explored by several researchers (Kalcik 1976; Goodwin 1980; Edelsky 1981; Harding 1982; Lay 1991; Lorraine 1991). For example, in examining conversational interaction of girls and boys in play groups, Marjorie Goodwin (1980) found that girls' conversations served to maintain agreement, avoid competition, and encourage cooperation. As discussed earlier, Susan Kalcik reports that women in CR groups like to build on each other's experiences, sharing stories in a collaboratively built (F2 in Carole Edelsky's terms) floor of conversation rather than a singly dominated floor. Likewise, feminist consciousness-raising groups promote a group atmosphere that invites all members to participate in conversation and attempt to be free of dominance or authority (Jenkins and Kramer 1978). I focus on these female groups because the behaviors used in the groups exemplify relational behaviors that I assert are essential to collaborative leadership.

It is logical to ask at this point, then, what relational behaviors include and how relational behaviors have been valued. Descriptions of relational behaviors are found in research that discusses egalitarian, cooperative group environments. Specific speech behaviors used in these egalitarian, collaborative environments include asking questions, using polite language, and sharing the floor of conversation—behaviors labeled "powerless" and female in some previous research. While Kalcik includes a list of communication strategies used by women in her study of female CR groups that includes politeness rules such as apologies, one-at-a-time speaking turns, interruptions in the form of questions, tying new points to discussion, unfinished stories, and a group production of a story, other studies are not as specific. For example, Jenkins and
Kramer (1978) state that CR groups ensure equal participation, but don't discuss how this is specifically achieved.

Instead of valuing these qualities as "powerless," some studies assert that egalitarian, cooperative behaviors are *empowering* and provide an alternative dominance to speech patterns labeled "male" and "dominant" in conversation (Valentine 1986; Finke 1993; Lamb 1991). These arguments rely upon the premise that differences in male and female communication function to maintain conversation and are not an indication of social power. For example, Tamara Valentine argues that though language can be a symbol of power, it is not necessarily hierarchical but "an expression of strength in itself and is motivated and interpreted differently by each sex for the mutual goal of effectively communicating in cross-sex discourse" (1986, 210). Valentine asserts that power in language is not a measure of dominance, control, and influence but a measure of "the ability to effectively communicate and to accomplish successful discourse." Valentine's vision of power as effective communication or power as "enabling" is met with disbelief by those who assert that it "ignores the uneven distribution of hierarchical power" (Singh and Lele 541). Similarly, asserting that relational behaviors that have been labeled powerless are powerful, useful, and valuable in group interaction may be met with opposition.

**Language relative to context**

The most influential support for arguments like Valentine's is perhaps from sociolinguist Deborah Tannen, who has conducted several studies on male and female communication differences. Her most recent research (1993) on gender and language reveals that linguistic strategies used by men and women
have diverse meanings. Her research appropriately summarizes the shift in linguistics from past studies that reveal stereotypical gender and language differences to the view that effective communicators adapt to situations and use a variety of speech behaviors, regardless of whether they have been labeled male or female. Her work supports androgynous behavior (speech behavior that utilizes documented male and female behaviors) as the most effective type of communication in the workplace.

While Tannen (1993) reviews past research that sought to correlate linguistic behavior with male dominance over women, she argues that linguistic behavior alone cannot determine dominance. The types of behaviors that in the past have been assumed to display dominance are interruptions, volubility, silence, topic raising, and amount of talk. Tannen explains that these characteristics can be used for different purposes and can have effects other than dominance in conversation. Tannen asserts that power and solidarity have many meanings and that the language is relative to context and situation. For example, she argues that interruption, silence, volubility, and topic control can be used by both powerful and powerless persons. She heartily argues that power and solidarity are ambiguous and that language must be looked at in context. By advocating the use of "powerful" language by "powerless" persons, Tannen suggests that labels of dominance and powerlessness are insufficient to describe effective communication or effective communicators. The relativity of language to context or situation described by Tannen promotes androgynous speech behavior. Language relative to context requires using appropriate speech behaviors, regardless if they have been described as male or female, for the situation.
The value of androgyny

Androgynous language includes speech patterns that have been described as male or female. Men and women who use androgynous language can potentially diminish categories of male or female speech behaviors. Androgynous behavior (including language use) has been advocated strongly by psychologist Sandra Bem, who promotes androgynous behavior as bringing out the best of male and female qualities. A possible result of androgyny (using male and female behaviors) is that gender labels become lost while qualities become emphasized—an emphasis that Bem ultimately concludes is preferrable. Because I argue for the use of relational behaviors by men and women for collaborative leadership, I find Bem's research relevant.

Bem designed a test (the BSRI—Bem Sex Role Inventory) to categorize behaviors of men and women as either masculine, feminine, or androgynous to explore the results of these behaviors. From numerous studies (Bem 1975; Bem 1978; Bem 1983), Bem concluded that androgynous subjects displayed both masculine and feminine qualities and were more likely to adapt their behavior to the situation. Subjects categorized as either masculine or feminine lacked such a variety of qualities, but the most surprising of Bem's findings was that the "feminine" subjects showed the least adaptability of all subjects.

As a result, Bem concluded from this and other studies that androgyny was the desired role to have because it did not limit behavior of men and women to stereotyped characteristics. Individuals who displayed stereotypical male and female behaviors, such as the "feminine females" in the study described above (1975), were unable to respond to certain situations.
Androgyny as described by Bem adds another dimension to my argument that speech behaviors characterized as male or female should be appreciated equally. Bem suggests that using only traditionally defined male or female behavior limits our abilities to communicate fully with one another. Androgynous behavior suggests that communicators use speech patterns of both males and females that, in turn, diminishes categorized behavior. Adopting androgynous behavior requires, therefore, that communicators accept and use behaviors without a concern for the labels that have previously been assigned them. Similarly, collaborative leadership requires the use of relational behaviors without a concern for the powerless label previously given to relational behaviors. In addition, not only should relational behaviors be valued for their essential function in collaborative leadership, but those who use relational behaviors should not be valued any less for using them.

**Professional communication**

The idea that androgynous behavior reduces value hierarchy is also important to professional communication. Because professional communication includes the study of small group interaction as well as issues of gender, attention to research in this area is relevant. Not surprisingly, research in professional communication within the last ten years has reinforced Bem's theories and findings that androgyny is desirable. Smeltzer and Werbel (1986) report that in managerial communication few if any stereotypical male and female verbal differences were apparent. Instead, Smeltzer and Werbel conclude that the "folk-linguistic" studies (or studies on gender and oral communication such as the ones discussed earlier: Aries 1976; Baird 1976; Lakoff 1978; Goodwin
1980) must be seriously considered when placed in contexts of business writing. Smeltzer and Werbel also propose that gender (and previous gender studies) not be made a factor in determining communication differences because stereotypes of men and women could cause unnecessary problems and concerns in business writing settings. Smeltzer and Werbel's assertion makes an important point for the promotion of gender label removal: that focusing on gender rather than on context can perpetuate stereotypes of male and female behavior.

Studies in the last five years (e.g., Lay 1989; Tebeaux 1990; Allen 1991) support Smeltzer and Werbel's conclusion that male and female dichotomy is not always present in professional communication; these studies attempt to look at the advantages of androgynous behavior in professional communication. The emphasis on androgyny in these studies promotes a view of professional communication without previous male or female biases. Therefore, reviewing androgyny as it is presented in these studies is useful for my discussion of relational behaviors. Androgyny, in diminishing categorized gender labels by blending male and female qualities for effective professional communication, exemplifies the way relational behaviors can be viewed without categorical male and female labels.

Androgyny has become an important perspective in professional communication, as the following studies report. While Elizabeth Tebeaux (1990) asserts that studies in the past have not looked at androgynous behavior as a factor of effective professional communication, she found support for androgyny in her analysis of gender, language, and professional communication. From her analysis Tebeaux concludes that previous business experience determines effective professional communication rather than categorized gender speech
behaviors. She further concludes that previous experience allows men and women to better adapt to a variety of work situations. Similarly, Mary Lay (1989) advocates the use of connecting or webbing behaviors for both men and women as an effective communication skill. In her review of previous gender studies that reveal competitive behavior in men and expressive, supportive, relational behavior in women, she suggests that "webs" (social support networks) that women have been reported to create have value when dealing with interpersonal conflict in groups and that men should be open to using relational skills. Ultimately, these studies argue for the importance of gender awareness and advocate androgynous behavior in the workplace as the most effective form of communication. Consequently, and relevant to my discussion of relational behaviors, accepting the theory of androgyny requires the acceptance of documented female speech behaviors as effective communication skills.

**Implications for pedagogy**

Introducing students to gender communication issues provides students with the opportunity to become aware of their own and others' communication styles. Discussing communication from a gender perspective may also allow students to uncover biases about male and female communication behaviors and provide them with the opportunity to develop a pool of effective communication strategies. The writing classroom provides an appropriate environment in which to discuss effective communication strategies.

Just as research in professional communication reports the advantages of drawing from a pool of male and female communication strategies (e.g., Jenkins and Kramer 1978; Frost 1980; Lay 1989; Allen 1991), composition studies have
begun also to assign value to cross-sex communication. Composition studies signal this value most strongly through the growing presence of dialogues on feminism, pedagogy, and alternative genres of writing that encourage students' "voices" to be heard. Often this research emphasizes the benefits of female communication and celebrates female difference. Because these studies heavily emphasize a feminist viewpoint, one could easily argue that the appreciation for male communication behaviors is lost in the strong focus on female communication behaviors. However, the attention given to feminist pedagogy and writing in composition studies indicates a growing awareness of the value of female communication. Increasing the value of communication labeled female has the potential to diminish the value hierarchy in male and female speech and can possibly promote the use of speech behaviors labeled female for both men and women. In this vein, I discuss how composition studies show encouraging support for the increasing value of female communication and its usefulness for all writing students.

In the last ten years, articles that have reported feminist approaches in pedagogy in collaboration, autobiographical essay, argument, and rhetoric (Lamb 1991; Peterson 1991; Bloom 1992; Bridwell-Bowles 1992; Kraemer 1992; Hollis 1992; Zawacki 1992; Burnett and Ewald 1994) support the use of relational, interpersonal behavior in terms of "voice." Much of feminist pedagogy has advocated student-centered classrooms and an environment that encourages students to find their "voice" (Rich 1979; Flynn 1988; Lay 1989; Lamb 1991; Bloom 1992; Eichborn et al. 1992; Hollis 1992; Finke 1993). Advocates of feminist pedagogy believe that the encouragement of student voices can be accomplished by a classroom in which the teacher's authority is not traditional; that is, feminist
pedagogy asserts that a teacher's knowledge assumed to be the "right" knowledge can stifle student discovery. Feminist pedagogy encourages listening to voices—student voices—in the absence (or seeming absence) of authority. Therefore issues of authority and power are often tangled in feminist pedagogy. Feminist bell hooks remarks that although many feminists believe authority should be absent in the classroom, when authority is present it does not have to indicate hierarchy: "... authority does not necessarily imply a positionality that can lead to dominance, whereas when we're dealing with questions of power we are talking about how we occupy the space of authority in a way that can reinforce and perpetuate domination" (10-11).

Feminist pedagogy has been described in terms similar to earlier descriptions of female speech—cooperative, egalitarian, encouraging—though unlike the "weak" connotation provided by previous speech research, feminist pedagogy views these qualities as vehicles for empowering student voices. Feminist pedagogy has been described as that which enables students to speak in terms of "participation, experiential, non-hierarchical student voice, empowerment, dialogue, and critical thinking" (Finke 9). Laurie Finke argues that the students' search for voice requires them to explore an "unmeant knowledge," an undiscovered voice inside the student. Could the use of relational skills act as a vehicle for the discovery of voice? Rather than describing the concrete speech behaviors necessary for the discovery of "unmeant knowledge," Finke abstractly asserts that feminism tries to probe and explore that unmeant knowledge and that teachers can help students find their voice by attempting to rid student-teacher relationships of mastery and authority: "This
inequality—the student's position of ignorance and resistance, the teacher's of supposed knowledge and mastery—is the 'bait” (19).

Finke suggests that this "bait" gives students grounds for the empowerment of their voices: "The exchange is the bait which enables the student's ignorance and resistance to come into play as dynamic forces..." (19). While the notion she states is not only intriguing but also relevant to members' voicing of opinions in small group interaction, it does not describe concretely the speech patterns that actualize those voices. Are relational, connecting behaviors instrumental in achieving the goals articulated by Finke? Though the answer to that question is not revealed by Finke, we can glean from her assertions the importance of assisting students in voicing their thoughts and opinions. This important goal of feminist pedagogy resonates with the goal articulated earlier in my discussion—that small group conversation be managed in a way to allow the voices of all members to be heard rather than silenced by domination. My study explores the role of relational behaviors in the accomplishment of that goal.

Several other articles (Flynn 1988; Bloom 1992; Eichborn et al. 1992; ), though they do not mention concrete speech behaviors to be used in the classroom, discuss the type of writing that feminist teachers should assign to empower students to find their voices. The autobiographical essay, in which students narrate experiences or events, is an assignment that many assert accomplishes the "voice" goal (Zawacki 1992). It can be argued, though, that gender biases unfairly influence students' perceptions of their experiences (Peterson 1991). As Don Kraemer cautions: "... gender studies ask how gender affects the way we use language, they do not ask how the way we use language
affects gender" (327). Kraemer's note of caution echoes the concerns articulated by Smeltzer and Werbel about gender focus unnecessarily creating stereotypes.

Concrete speech behaviors are mentioned in feminist pedagogy discussed by Catherine Lamb, who advocates the use of collaboration and shared leadership through speech communication practices of mediation and negotiation (1991). Lamb asserts that the power relationships in argumentative writing need not be hierarchical; rather, she suggests that power can be enabling, energizing, and can reduce hierarchy (much like Valentine's assertions discussed earlier). Lamb views knowledge as collaborative and cooperative, writing as process, and power as enabling. Lamb connects the strands for my argument: that women's ways of speaking as expressive and relational have value in collaborative processes and in creating a different type of power, free from hierarchy, that enables rather than dominates.

I have drawn attention to composition studies as an example of a discipline that is beginning to recognize and value women's communication behaviors. The webs created from issues of pedagogy, feminism, authority, power, and voices are ones that I believe contribute to the discussion of valuing female as well as male communication in our profession. Emphasis on composition studies also provides a bridge to the next chapter in which I discuss and describe the interaction of small groups in a first-year college composition classroom. I discuss the interaction of these student groups in terms of how their interaction displays relational speech behaviors.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The intersecting areas of small group communication, gender studies, and leadership frame the general issue of whether or not dichotomized gender labels of speech behavior influence how small group leadership is viewed. I approach this general issue by describing the use of relational behaviors for collaborative leadership in eight student groups. I investigate eight student groups to explore the following research question: How do relational behaviors contribute to a collaborative style of leadership in small group interaction? I have explored this question by examining small group interaction of first-year college composition students engaged in an assigned task. In this chapter I describe the specific methodology I used to investigate collaborative leadership. Sections of this chapter include the following descriptions: a rationale for studying student small groups, composition classes, design of the study, categories and a rationale for categories of relational behavior, application of coding scheme, and sample speech features of relational behavior.

Valuing classroom small groups

Though I could have studied several different types of groups for the purposes of this study, because I am a composition instructor with a continuing interest in pedagogy I chose to study small group interaction of task groups in English 105, a second-semester course in a required two-semester composition sequence for first-year students at a large midwestern state university. Studying
classroom task groups has the immediate pedagogical purpose of analyzing and improving the usefulness of group work in the classroom. By understanding how groups are functioning in class, instructors are in a better position to assist groups.

Studying small group work in classrooms is also beneficial for students. Classes that require small group work provide an important opportunity for students to learn about communicating with one another. In addition, becoming aware of how people interact in groups is essential knowledge for leadership. The experience gained in group activities in the classroom is, therefore, a valuable learning experience. It may help prepare students for future situations in which dynamics are more complex and in which power is more of an element. In situations in which power is an element, leaders who do have power can utilize it to create enabling, energizing, open environments rather than environments that stifle the opinions of others.

Description of English 105 classes

My position as an English 105 instructor allowed me to study group interaction in the two classes I taught during fall semester 1993 at Iowa State University. English 105 is an introductory argumentative writing course. I designed my sections of the course to help students learn to read, understand, analyze, doubt, and use outside sources to build an argument on a controversial topic. Both classes used the same syllabus, text, and assignments. Six paper assignments in the course were designed to lead up to a final source paper on a controversial topic. Students' ages ranged from 18 to 23 years old, and though the majority of students were first-year students, the English 105 classes also
Table 1

Students in composition classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-year students</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

included sophomores and juniors (see Table 1).

Much of the class involved group work. In each class, I divided and assigned students into groups of four or five. I formed groups by attempting to achieve a gender balance (i.e., two males, two females). There were six groups in each class, and students were assigned work in those groups for the entire semester on a variety of group projects including peer response workshops, discussion questions, and collaborative planning. Each group met five times during the semester for peer response workshops, one time outside of class for formulating discussion questions on an assigned set of essays, and two times for collaborative planning (one time in class and one time outside of class, tape recorded). Because many group projects (with the same group) were required

---

2 Peer response workshops required students to exchange rough drafts of papers with members in their assigned groups. Members were free to comment on and respond to the drafts during the class hour designated for peer response. Five peer response workshops were held during the semester; students had completed all five workshops by the time the task for this study was assigned.

Discussion questions were assigned to groups once during the semester for one of three discussion days held in class. Discussion days were designated class days for discussion of two or three assigned essays. On discussion days, two groups were responsible for formulating a list of 6-8 questions that would lead discussion on the assigned essays. Each group had one opportunity to form a list of discussion questions for discussion days. Group work for discussion questions was completed outside of class.

Collaborative planning is "a writing strategy to help inexperienced writers consider elements such as purpose, audience, organization, and design. These elements are typically used by experienced writers but seldom considered by inexperienced writers" (Burnett et al. 1994). Collaborative planning was assigned twice during the semester. For collaborative planning, students worked together with one other group member to review rough drafts and offer suggestions for improvement. One of the collaborative planning sessions was completed in class and one session was completed outside of class and was tape recorded.
during the semester, students were very familiar with the members in their group by the end of the semester.

**Design of the study**

The English 105 group project that was tape recorded for the purposes of this study was assigned late in the semester as part of the required coursework. The project required groups to review drafts of argument papers written for their course; the project was designed to help them prepare for their final argument papers for the course. Each group completed two tasks:

1. **Criteria Setting**—Students developed a list of criteria to evaluate a comprehensive source paper (a ten-page research paper that was their final project of the semester). For the source paper, students were asked to write an argument about a controversial topic and use ten sources (presenting multiple views on the issue) as support for their argument.

2. **Evaluation**—After developing a list of criteria, groups read a cluster of three source papers and evaluated them on the basis of the criteria they had listed. Clusters are described in Figure 1.

```
Cluster 1 (written by students in Class A, evaluated by Class B)
Minimum Tillage Farming
The Death Penalty
Reintroduction of the Wolf to Yellowstone

Cluster 2 (written by students in Class B, evaluated by Class A)
Save the Spotted Owl
Censorship of Books
Overpopulation
```

**Figure 1:** Papers discussed by groups
I selected the papers to be discussed by the student groups. I chose three papers each from Class A and Class B. I selected one paper from each class that was above average, one paper from each class that was average, and one paper that was below average. Criteria for rating the papers was based on two standards: (1) the English department standards of material, organization, expression, and mechanics; and (2) standards discussed in class throughout the composition course such as the use of ethos, pathos, and logos. All papers were rough drafts of the final source paper to be turned in for the composition class. Because I was the instructor, I determined how well each paper met the criteria standards listed above. All selected papers for this study had met the criteria for the source paper, though some met the criteria better than others. A description of the task and the source paper assignment sheet have been included (see Appendix A and Appendix B).

Each student group discussed one cluster of papers. All groups were given the cluster of papers written by students in the other class. The two tasks (criteria setting and evaluation) were assigned to groups as a final project. Students were aware that this project would be used for my study and were given the option of not participating in the study (one student did decline to participate). Though participating students were aware that the tapes of their interaction would be used in my thesis, they were not aware that I would be analyzing their transcripts for leadership or interactional behaviors.

All students whose work or interaction has been used for this study have signed Human Subject Participant Forms to grant permission for use of student participation. (The Iowa State Human Subject Review Committee approved my
methodology. See Appendix C for a copy of the form and supporting materials approved by ISU Human Subjects Committee.)

Relational behaviors for collaborative leadership

In response to the research question (How do webbing or relational behaviors indicate leadership in group interaction?), I explore whether or not relational behaviors in small group communication contribute to a leadership that is constructed through group interaction. In general, collaborative leadership creates an encouraging environment in which members feel free to contribute to discussion. This type of leadership relies upon relational behaviors demonstrated by one or more group members who invite participation of all members.

Categories of relational behavior

I developed a list of relational behaviors for group work that may contribute to collaborative leadership in groups. The relational behaviors I describe identify explicit interpersonal comments in interaction rather than explicit task or procedural comments. I noticed from pilot group transcripts (not used for final analysis in this study) that certain relational speech patterns consistently occurred throughout interaction. These recurring speech behaviors are interpersonal: naming other group members, referring to previous comments made by other group members, and encouraging or supporting other group members. The above specific relational behaviors focus on people in task-oriented groups because they invite group members to participate in discussion and they refer to previous comments that group members have made.
Relational comments open the conversational floor rather than allow one person to monopolize the conversation.

In findings dramatically different from some earlier research about group interaction, I noticed that both male and female students used relational speech behaviors in group interaction. These relational behaviors, whether displayed by one or many group members, seemed to signal leadership in the group.

I have outlined four categories of relational behaviors: naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating. These four categories of relational behaviors are briefly described below:

(1) Naming—Naming comments explicitly mention other group members by name or pronoun. Most often, naming comments direct the conversation by soliciting input from other group members. By soliciting the opinions of others, naming comments function to open the floor of conversation rather than allow it to be dominated by a single or few persons, resulting in a collaboratively built discussion.

(2) Positioning comments—Positioning comments describe the stance of the speaker about a previous comment. Positioning can take the form of agreements or disagreements about an idea or statement mentioned by another group member. Comments in this category serve an interpersonal function because they build upon the ideas of others in the

---

3 I originally began with five categories of connecting behavior: naming, bridging, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating. I have collapsed the naming and bridging categories to form a single naming category that includes bridging comments. I found that bridging comments were not distinctly different from naming comments. Bridging comments, because they refer to another group member by name, are similar to naming comments that also refer to group members by name in order to direct conversation.
Positioning statements help to develop a collaborative conversational floor by stimulating discussion.

(3) Supporting comments—Supporting comments function like compliments by providing positive feedback and encouragement to another group member and therefore attend to interpersonal concerns in group interaction.

(4) Reciprocating—Reciprocating comments are polite responses ("Please" and "thank you"). They are interpersonal in nature because polite responses show courtesy toward other group members.

**Rationale for categories**

All four categories identify explicit interpersonal comments in interaction. I developed the naming, supporting, and reciprocating categories because to me they represent relational speech behaviors described by research about gender and communication. The category of positioning was developed as I reviewed pilot study transcripts of group behavior. I saw patterns of agreement in the form of repetition and decided that comments showing positioning make important contributions to collaborative leadership.

These four categories focus on people skills in task-oriented groups; in this study I explore how interpersonal, relational comments contribute to a type of collaborative leadership that fosters an encouraging, egalitarian environment. Naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating categories refer to people in that they invite group members to participate in discussion, and they refer to previous comments that group members have made. Simply put, relational comments open the conversational floor rather than allow one person to
monopolize the conversation. Diminishing conversational domination in all group settings, however, may not always be desired. Some group meetings, for example, may have different purposes other than open discussion and may necessitate that one person primarily lead a meeting.

For the purpose of open discussion, such as in the context of an English composition class in argument, relational behaviors used for collaborative leadership seem appropriate. However, while in theory collaborative leadership encourages the contribution of all group members' opinions, the use of relational behaviors does not guarantee that all members contribute to discussion. For example, not all group members may want to be included in interaction, despite others' attempts to include them. Likewise, the use of relational behaviors can't make a member participate. But relational behaviors can invite a member to participate. The principle behind relational behaviors is that their use at least attempts to include group members in discussion so as not to allow the conversation to be dominated.

Relational behaviors serve an especially critical role for developing an open discussion floor in groups in which members do not freely contribute their opinions, thoughts, or ideas. In such groups, the display of relational behaviors may provide the necessary encouragement for a group member to voice his or her opinion. Even so, members will have to participate in order to be a part of the leadership. Not all groups will catch on or maximize the benefits of such interaction. Some may use naming comments, for example, as a way to monopolize the floor rather than maintain a collaboratively built floor. Monopolizing the floor defeats the purpose of collaborative leadership;
relational behaviors serve to direct conversation to another group member, not to give others the opportunity to dominate the conversation.

Application of coding scheme to transcripts

Coding the naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating comments involved dividing transcripts by conversational turns. A conversational turn is distinguished easily in transcripts by the name (or initial) of the speaker found at the beginning of a line.5

1 Turn: Kim: we have to document 10 sources
2 Turn: Steve: document 10 sources, and it's gotta be on a controversial subject more than one view

Lengths of conversational turns vary. Most often turns are one to two lines in length ("lines" are marked by numbers in the left margin of the transcripts). Some turns in the transcripts are up to eight to ten lines in length. Because some turns are longer than others, it cannot be assumed that "one turn" is equivalent in all transcripts. The length of conversational turns may affect the percentages in the data.

Reliability

Two raters were used in this study: myself and another second-year English graduate student. Each of us had completed all coursework for an M.A. in English. Unlike the other co-rater, I had two years of experience teaching first-year composition. The co-rater had experience with linguistic and gender research. Initially, I applied the coding scheme to all the transcripts used for this

4Complete transcripts of all eight student groups are found in Appendix E.
5All names of participating students have been changed.
The co-rater, who I trained, applied the coding scheme to four transcripts used for this study. Written instructions that were used for training the co-rater to identify naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating comments in transcripts for this study are included in Appendix D. Four transcripts coded by the trained co-rater showed 74% agreement with my coding.

Disagreements between my coding and that of the co-rater fell into two categories. One category was coding of the word “yeah” as a positioning comment rather than conversational filler. I often coded the word "yeah" as a positioning comment while the co-rater sometimes coded the word "yeah" as positioning and sometimes did not code the word "yeah" at all. Discrepancies are due to the interpretation of the word "yeah" as filler from listening to audio tapes of the student groups. The second category of disagreement was coding questions like “Now what?” as naming comments that opened conversation to a group without specifically directing conversation to one person or to the group. While I did not code these questions as naming comments, the co-rater sometimes coded these questions as naming comments.

When these two categories of disagreement are removed, the co-rater and I had an agreement of 82%. Although these two categories of disagreement occurred occasionally, most other subcategories of relational behaviors were agreed upon in our coding. Nevertheless, the categories of disagreement need to be refined to achieve more accuracy in future studies.

**Example features of speech that indicate relational behavior in groups**

As I explained earlier, the categories of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating were developed to distinguish comments that refer to or
express a concern for the acknowledgment of people in group interaction. Each of the categories codes comments that explicitly mention other group members by name or pronoun, refer to a comment made previously by another member, or show courtesy or support to another member. I explore whether the shared use of these four categories of relational behaviors creates an open floor of discussion and contributes to a collaborative style of leadership.

1. Naming

Naming comments direct conversation in two ways: solicitations and directives. Solicitations explicitly ask for the opinion or comment of another specific group member. Naming solicitations direct the comment to another group member by naming them or using “you” to refer to them:

Ex. What do you think, Jen? (solicitation)
Ex. John, you haven't said anything yet. (solicitation)
Ex. I think you should respond to this. (directive)

Directives are imperative statements (in the next example, the "you" is understood):

Ex. Read the next example. ("you" understood - directive)

Naming can also open the floor of conversation by addressing the group. These examples must include the pronoun "we" and clearly open the floor of conversation to any group member.

Ex. What do we think?
Ex. What should we do next?

Naming comments do not include questions that indirectly open the floor to the group because, unlike the “you” understood directive, questions that are not directives do not as clearly address the group (“we”) as understood. Therefore, questions that open the floor of conversation must directly address a group member or include the group as "we" in order to be coded.

NOT INCLUDED
Ex. Next?
Ex. So the final decision is what?

Naming does not include directives or commands addressed to the group.

NOT INCLUDED
Ex. Let’s move on.

Bridging (a subcategory of naming). Bridging comments are naming comments that exclusively refer to a previous comment in conversation. Bridging comments must name the member (by pronoun or by name) who contributed the previous comment. By referring to the previous comments in conversation, bridging comments function to create solidarity among group members by displaying awareness and attention to the contribution of other group members.

Ex. What Bob said earlier was really interesting.
Ex. It’s just like what Becky was talking about a minute ago.
Ex. Laura, I don’t understand what you just said.
Referrals can also bridge to the speaker or to the group as a collective "we":

Ex. I said that earlier...
Ex. We already said that, didn't we?

Bridging can include a single reference to another group member by naming that member without directing the conversation to that group member. Name referrals (or pronoun referrals) acknowledge other group members and, therefore, are included as bridging comments because they draw interpersonal attention to group members.

Ex. Well, Jim, I think that the paper should be third.

Bridging statements may be double coded if a name is included in the statement:

Ex. Thank you, Linda. ("Thank you" is a supporting comment)

Bridging comments do not include referral to a previous comment that does not mention the author by name or pronoun. Bridging also does not account for nonverbal communication; that is, a group member may address the author of a previous comment by pointing to that person.

2. Positioning

While the coding of naming focuses on comments that direct conversation to the group or to a group member, the second category focuses on comments that express the speaker's opinion(s). Group members may take a stance on a comment, idea, or opinion another group member has initiated. Positioning statements are responses and can be either positive or negative.
Positioning comments are not evaluative comments; they simply indicate a speaker's position on an idea.

**Agreement**

Ex. *Agree with you.*


Positioning statements that are agreements can take the form of *repetition* of an exact phrase by another member:

Ex. M: *We need to talk about bibliography.*

    Y: *bibliography, yes, we need to talk about bibliography.*

Positioning does not include repetitions that agree with statements made more than 3-4 lines earlier in the transcript. Comments that agree with statements made earlier than 3-4 lines in the transcript are more difficult to identify. In order to make positioning comments as explicit as possible, I wanted positioning comments to include only agreements of statements made immediately before a positioning statement.

**NOT INCLUDED**

Ex. M: *We need to talk about bibliography.*

    Y: *and we need to talk about documentation.*

    Z: *documentation, yes.*

    Y: *What shall we say about documentation?*

    Z: *We need to talk about bibliography.*

Agreement can be displayed in only *one word or phrase:*
Ex. M: I think paper A is the best one.

Y: yes.

The word "yes" may not always signal agreement in positioning. **Positioning does not include** the word "yes" when it is only an answer to a question.

**NOT INCLUDED**

Ex. M: Have you read this paper yet?

Y: yes.

The word "yeah" can also signal agreement in the same way that "yes" does. "Yeah" is a relational behavior **only when it signals agreement with an idea**, not when it is spoken as an answer to a question (like above) or as filler in conversation. As filler, words like "yeah" and "um hmm" may fill in spots of conversation (also called backchanneling) but are not included as agreement when they only serve to fill in conversation.

**NOT INCLUDED**

Ex. M: 'cause those points are important but still

Y: yeah

T: yeah, well, you should know them, I mean

The word "yeah" is considered positioning when it conveys a strong sense that it is spoken as an agreement. "Yeah" may often be followed by a supporting comment to indicate agreement.

Ex. M: I know you said use 10 sources but that's not the list,

Y: **yeah**, that's just general guidelines.
Or agreement can be expressed in a *rewording* of a previous member's phrase:

**Ex.** M: We need to look at organization next.  
Y: *Organization should be before documentation, yes.*

Positioning comments do not include statements that imply agreement with a previous line by extending or elaborating the idea.

**NOT INCLUDED**

**Ex.** M: We need to talk about bibliography.  
Y: The bibliography should have 10 sources.

Repetitions in the positioning category *must illustrate agreement* for another's idea.

**Disagreement.** Positioning statements can also be disagreements. Disagreements count as relational behavior because they acknowledge and connect with comments made previously by other group members.

**Ex.** Well, Jeff, the 10 sources was important *but however I don't think it's the most important.*

**Ex.** Oh, *I disagree* totally.

**Ex.** *No, I don't think that is right.*

Disagreements must be explicit. If it is difficult to identify a specific disagreement, it should not be coded as a positioning disagreement.
NOT INCLUDED
Ex. Yeah, but...
Ex. Well, I think instead that...
These examples do not indicate disagreement strongly enough. The words "but" or "instead" may not lead to a disagreeing comment, but simply may contrast a previous idea.

3. Supporting

Supporting comments are yet another category separate from the naming and positioning categories. Supporting comments do not direct conversation, nor do they indicate a stance or position on an idea. Rather, supporting comments provide encouragement or praise to another group member, often in the form of compliments. Supportive comments are positive evaluations, but do not necessarily indicate a position or stance. For example, a member could really like a previous comment but not necessarily agree with it. In most cases, supporting comments do indicate agreement.

Ex. Good job, Beth.
Ex. That was a smart comment you made about the last paper.
Ex. I really liked what you said a minute ago.
Ex. Good point, but I don't agree with you.

Comments in this category may be double coded with naming (bridging) because they often refer to previous comments. Using the same examples, naming (bridging) is indicated in italics:
Ex. **That was a smart comment** you made about the last paper.

Ex. **I really liked** what you said a minute ago.

Ex. **Good point**, but I don’t agree with you.

4. **Reciprocating**

Reciprocating comments often occur in response to supporting comments and show courtesy toward other group members. These comments differ from naming, positioning, and supporting comments in that they are specific, traditional, common responses of politeness such as “please,” “thank you,” and “you’re welcome.” They can be a response to compliments and often may have a name attached to the acceptance.

Ex. Why thank you, Barbara.

Ex. Thank you for saying that.

Ex. You’re welcome.

The reciprocating category is limited to comments that explicitly demonstrate courtesy phrases such as "please" and "thank you" and "you're welcome."

While literature on compliments and politeness is extensive and interpretation of compliments is complex, I include this restricted category because I feel that explicit courtesy statements create an environment in which members feel free to contribute.

Having described my methodology, four categories of relational behavior, and a rationale for developing this methodology, I describe results of my study in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

I have thus far attempted to argue that collaborative leadership relies upon the use of relational speech behaviors. This argument relates to a larger issue concerning the influence of dichotomous gender labels on views of leadership. More specifically, I have attempted to explore the following research question: *How do relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership?*

To address my research question, I have explored three issues in my study and observation of eight student groups: (1) whether or not relational behaviors exist in student small group interaction; (2) whether or not relational behaviors are used more by women than by men; and (3) whether or not the use of relational behaviors contributes to an open discussion environment and, in turn, contributes to a collaborative style of leadership in student small groups.

To explore these areas, I developed a coding scheme of relational behaviors and used the coding scheme to analyze the transcripts of eight student groups engaged in a task for a first-year argumentative writing course. The results from this study offer descriptive information about the frequency and use of relational behaviors by females and males in these eight student small groups. Furthermore, this study provides direction for future research about the use of relational behaviors and collaborative leadership in small group interaction. In this chapter, I discuss results of this study of eight student groups in relation to the three issues mentioned earlier: (1) do relational behaviors exist? (2) do
women use relational behaviors more than men? and (3) does the use of relational behaviors contribute to a collaborative style of leadership?

**Do relational behaviors exist?**

Results from this study show that relational behaviors existed in all eight groups. Applying the coding scheme to these eight transcripts shows that an average of forty percent of all conversational turns (in all transcripts combined) contain the relational behaviors described by the coding scheme. Results are reported in percentages of relational behaviors per turn in each transcript. That is, the number of coded relational behaviors for each transcript has been divided by the total number of conversational turns in each transcript and converted to a percentage.

**Total use of relational behaviors**

In all eight transcripts, a total of 2020 conversational turns has been recorded. In those 2020 turns, a total of 817 relational behaviors has been recorded, resulting in an average of 40.4% relational behaviors in the total number of conversational turns. Percentages of relational behaviors for individual groups range from 26.5% at lowest to 54.6% at highest (see Table 2). Six of the eight transcripts show that over 40% of students' total number of conversational turns displayed relational behaviors.

---

6Percentages are, of course, affected by the length of turns in the transcript. For example, a higher percent of connecting behaviors may be due to fewer, longer turns in the transcripts. Longer turns in the transcript may include more than one instance of connecting behaviors.
Table 2
Percent of relational behaviors per turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># of Turns</th>
<th>Percent of relational behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=Naming  P=Positioning
S=Supporting R=Reciprocating

Though the total use of relational behaviors for all eight groups averaged 40.4%, the four relational behaviors of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating were not used by all groups with equal frequency. In every group, supporting and reciprocating behaviors were infrequent in comparison to naming and positioning comments (see Table 2). For example, 15.2% of 118 conversational turns in group 7 contained naming comments, 31.3% contained positioning comments, 2.5% contained supporting comments, and 0% contained reciprocating comments. An uneven distribution of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating behaviors existed in every group. This uneven distribution merits further investigation. Perhaps behaviors used more
frequently (naming and positioning) play a stronger role in collaborative leadership.

**Frequency of naming and positioning comments**

A use of relational behaviors in each group may not include comments of all four naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating categories. My data shows that while reciprocating and supporting comments were infrequent, naming and positioning comments proved to be the most frequent of all four categories of relational behavior. Naming comments, while second to positioning, occur far less often than positioning comments. Although naming occurs less often than positioning, I argue that the single most important characteristic of collaborative leadership is the distribution of naming comments among group members.

The greater importance of naming comments is logical. Collaborative leadership in principle encourages group members to share in the interaction; naming comments open the floor of conversation to other group members. Though naming comments may be most characteristic of collaborative leadership, positioning comments are also important. Through positioning comments, members voice their opinions. Supporting and reciprocating comments attend to interpersonal needs in the group but are not as prevalent as naming and positioning comments in promoting collaborative leadership. In the following sections, I discuss the use of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating comments in more detail.
**Naming.** Naming is displayed in all eight groups. Though in some groups one member may display naming more than others (groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 demonstrate this), the same person in a group does not solely demonstrate naming behaviors. This finding contributes to the idea that collaborative leadership is distributed by behaviors in the group interaction.

In groups with high-level interaction, although naming is distributed among group members, one member seems to dominate naming behavior. In groups 3, 4, and 6, the men had the highest number of naming behaviors. I find this surprising because I had accepted earlier research that labeled naming behaviors as typically female. To see these behaviors demonstrated more by men than women in these three groups contradicted what I expected from the data. In other groups, a more frequent use of naming behaviors by men was not the case. In groups 5 and 7, for instance, naming was dominated by women. In all eight groups, naming comments are made by both females and males. These results show that relational (naming) behavior is not exclusively or even primarily a female behavior.

**Inadequacy of coding scheme for naming.** While the coding scheme codes comments that explicitly name other group members or address the group ("Jen, what do you think about this," or "How do we want to rank these?"), the coding system does not identify comments that open the floor of conversation but do not explicitly name a group member or the group collectively ("OK. What's next?"). Future refined coding schemes may benefit from including questions and prompts as a speech behavior that encourages collaborative leadership. Questions and prompts that open conversation to the group are truly
in the spirit of collaborative leadership, for they certainly open the floor of conversation to all group members and therefore function similarly to naming comments that direct conversation (though they do not name or address a member or group directly). The coding scheme I have developed does not code questions or prompts that do not include a direct reference to the group as "we" or to a specific group member.

For example, in the following transcript from group 3, Kari asks questions (in italics in the excerpt below) to which the group responds in agreement by saying "check." The coding scheme does not code the questions that Kari asks unless she would direct the question to a specific group member or the group as "we." Instead, in this transcript excerpt, other group members [John and Ron] respond in agreement (coded as positioning statements).

Kari: Ok, so let's do a final list of our criteria. 10 sources?
John: 10 sources.
P
Ron: Check.
P
John: Gotcha.
P
Kari: Writer's point of view?
P
Ron and John: Check.
P
Kari: Grammar?
P
Ron and John: Check.
P
Kari: Organization?
P
John and Randy: Check.
P
Kari: Thesis.
P
John: Check.
P
Kari: Both views.
P
John: Check, check.
P
Kari: and documentation using MLA.
P
John: that's correct. Not the other one.
P
Kari: With an ending bibliography page.
P
John: Check. No, no annotated bibliography (playfully hitting Ron). (laughter)

Unfortunately, my coding scheme does not capture prompts to the group such as the ones Kari illustrates. Kari's prompts are also undirected because they do not address a specific member or the group. Yet her prompts in this excerpt
definitely lead the group discussion. Consequently, Kari's contributions to leadership and collaborative discussion (while important to the group's interaction) are not counted. My coding scheme, though designed to detect relational behaviors that have been typically described as female, did not consider the characteristics and contributions of Kari's approach to leadership.

Prompts not addressed to any person or addressed to the group in general were not solely characteristic of women, though, as the below excerpt illustrates. In this excerpt, Jerry prompts the group (shown in italics). Prompts to the group occurred in most groups, to which group members would position themselves.

```
N  Jerry:  ok, so what do you guys think should go first?
  Tony:  I say organization
P  Tasha:  me too. . .
P  Jerry:  me three, OK, then, thesis?
P  Tasha:  yeah, thesis
Jerry:  mark down what we're doin' first so,
  Tasha:  OK, do you have a pen? I do. OK, organization 1,
P  Tasha:  thesis 2.
```

Because the questions (prompts to the group) do not include "we" or directly address the group, they are not counted as naming comments ("OK, then, thesis?"). A future coding scheme should capture questions that open conversation to the floor and count them as naming comments.

**Positioning.** Positioning is, in all transcripts but one, the prevailing category of displayed relational behavior. Only in one transcript (group 4) are positioning comments second to naming comments. Positioning in the high-level interaction groups is displayed more frequently among members than in low-level interactive groups. Positioning in the form of agreement (rather than
disagreement) occurred most often and was the strongest category of relational behavior of all categories of behavior. Positioning functioned to create cohesion about decisions to be made by the group, as demonstrated by group 5 in the excerpt below:

N Adam: so tell us about this Johnny goes to the library one
Erica: oh, it's so bad. That was like in the first paragraph or something.
P Jo: yeah
P Adam: yeah
P Erica: yeah. Johnny arrives at the school library. I thought that the writing style was really really simple I had a hard time believing it.
P Jo: yeah. I guess I can agree. I mean, I guess I can agree with that I guess it is kind of simple but I thought it was kind of a neat perspective too. Because I thought, you know, it's true, the way, I mean, that they, just take books off the shelf and
P Erica: Yeah, I agree with that. I, just totally just thought that their writing style was sooo simple and they were stuck on saying the same thing, over and over and over again. They really didn't have an argument
P Jo: yeah

In this excerpt, Jo, Erica, and Adam build agreement by saying "yeah." Jo, Adam, and Erica all agree in the beginning of the excerpt that the paper "Johnny goes to the library" is bad. Second, Erica makes the comment that "the writing style was really simple" to which Jo agrees. Third, Jo comments that the perspective of the paper was "kind of a neat perspective," to which Erica agrees. Both Jo and Erica articulate their opinions by saying "I agree." Group cohesion in this example is created by the exchange of ideas, comments, and opinions. The cohesion is solidified by the agreements expressed by group members, as they build upon each others' ideas.

**Disagreements in positioning.** Disagreements, like agreements, function to stimulate discussion or form a consensus. In the following excerpt, group 3 members are discussing the ranking of a paper (disagreements are in
italics). Lynn disagrees with the rest of the group, prompting more disagreement and discussion from others. Positioning statements in the form of disagreements in this excerpt provoke discussion and refer back to statements made previously by other members.

N  Kari: OK, what do you think is wrong with it?
Lynn: I think that it runs on, wait, gimme one.
Ron: //It does have a, it is a little redundant and tend to repeat itself.
P  Lynn: //I think it runs on. Very redundant. It doesn't ever tell the other side of the story.
P  Ron: Yes.
P  Randy: Oh, I disagree.
P  Ron: Yes, it does tell the other side of the story.
P  John: I'm gonna have to disagree.

Positioning statements coded in this way show how decisions are backed up and made according to the group. I find it noteworthy that no one makes the decision in these groups alone; opinions and descriptions are discussed and agreed upon by the group before they are completed. Group decisions stress the importance of positioning comments to collaborative leadership. Positioning comments are essential to collaborative leadership because they articulate the opinions of each group member.

**Supporting and reciprocating.** The supporting and reciprocating categories were infrequent in my data. Though supporting comments were more prevalent than reciprocating comments (19 supporting comments and 14 reciprocating), the combined number of supporting and reciprocating comments (33) amounts to only 4% of the total 817 relational behavior comments recorded. While in principle supporting comments function to support other group members' contributions to the discussion, I found that (1) very few comments were coded as supporting comments and (2) support was given most often in the
form of positioning comments rather than compliments. By agreeing with others' opinions, positioning comments provide positive feedback to others. Supporting comments in the form of compliments (as described in Chapter 3: "That's good," "Good idea, good idea," "I like that") were not prevalent and did not distinguish themselves as a strong collaborative leadership category.

Similarly, reciprocating comments did not occur often enough to distinguish a strong category of collaborative leadership. In theory, reciprocating comments are interpersonal because they show courtesy to others. Though showing courtesy does show an awareness of others and a concern for group dynamics, I found that reciprocating did not occur often in these transcripts and did not contribute much to collaborative leadership. In opposition to research that categorizes relational behavior as female, females and males in this study displayed a near equal number of coded supporting and reciprocating behaviors.

A closer examination of the distribution of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating comments has shown an uneven distribution of these four types of comments in this study. I argue that naming comments are the single most important behavior for collaborative leadership because they function to open the floor of conversation. Positioning comments are important in that they allow students to articulate their stances on ideas mentioned by other group members. Supporting and reciprocating behaviors are infrequent in the student groups observed for this study.

**Do women use relational behaviors more than men?**

Past research in gender and communication has reported that women use relational speech behaviors more frequently than men. In contrast, my results
show that of the relational behaviors I have described, men and women in this study used relational behaviors approximately equally (see Table 3). According to these averages, males use naming and reciprocating behaviors slightly more often than females, and females use positioning and supporting behaviors slightly more often than males. Despite the variations, the differences in the use of relational behaviors among males and females are small.

It should be noted that the averages in the table above do not accurately represent male and female use of relational behaviors in every group. In some groups, the most frequent use of relational behaviors was demonstrated by men (groups 2, 3, 6, and 8). Conversely, in groups 4, 5, and 6 the most frequent use of relational behaviors was demonstrated by women. Therefore, the near equal averages reported in Table 3 do not reflect an equal use of relational behaviors for each group in this study. However, these results do show that because males sometimes display relational behaviors more than females, relational behaviors in these groups are not exclusively female.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per male</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per female</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does the use of relational behaviors contribute to a collaborative style of leadership?**

Through developing the categories of naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating, I have attempted to identify speech behaviors that previous
gender communication research has described as relational behavior. I have defined these behaviors as characteristics of collaborative leadership among members in small groups. The results of this study show that naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating behaviors can be identified and quantified in conversational interaction. While naming, positioning, supporting, and reciprocating behaviors, as I have defined them, can be identified in the transcripts of group interaction for this study, I do not believe that the results of this study show definitively whether or not the use of relational behaviors contributes to a collaborative style of leadership. Rather, results show that naming and positioning comments occur more frequently than supporting or reciprocating comments. Perhaps the greater frequency of naming and positioning behaviors suggests that the use of naming and positioning behaviors are important factors for collaborative leadership.

Assessing use of relational behaviors by groups

Although it is tempting to rank groups and characterize them according to the total percentage of relational behaviors each group displayed in the data (see Table 2), I have found that straight percentages do not reveal an adequate assessment of relational group behaviors. Rather, I find that it is more revealing to analyze how behaviors are distributed among group members. Straight percentages reveal the total number of behaviors displayed by group members, but they do not describe the participation of each group member that is essential to collaborative leadership. Analyzing the distribution rather than the percent of total relational behaviors allows for more of a contextualized view of group interaction rather than looking at a single dimension of group interaction.
Although all systems of ranking data can be inadequate, I decided to rank groups according to how relational behaviors are distributed among group members. This decision was based on the principle that groups which display collaborative leadership show a distribution of relational behaviors among group members. A distribution of behaviors shows that group members are contributing to the discussion (hence, facilitating collaborative leadership). However, in analyzing the data I discovered that ranking groups according to how all relational behaviors were distributed did not effectively distinguish interaction from group to group. In addition to focusing on the distribution of relational behaviors, I found a distinguishing characteristic to be the use of naming comments. As I mentioned earlier, naming comments, of all four comments, demonstrate the spirit of collaborative leadership the most by soliciting the input of other group members.

Because naming comments most demonstrated spirit of collaborative leadership, I categorized groups that displayed a more frequent use of naming behavior as demonstrating a higher level of relational behavior interaction (labeled "groups with high-level relational interaction"). Of the eight groups I have analyzed, six groups show a more frequent use of naming behaviors, while two groups show a particularly infrequent use of naming behaviors (labeled "groups with low-level relational interaction").

According to the data from my groups with high-level interaction, group members shared naming responsibilities, though one person may have performed these behaviors more than others. Conversely, in low-level interaction groups, naming was not well distributed or was seldom performed at
all. I have ranked the groups according to how well naming behaviors are distributed among group members (see Tables 4 and 5).

**Low-level interaction groups**

The data show that groups 1 and 2 have a low distribution of and very few naming comments (see Table 4). Though both groups showed a high percent of relational behaviors, (group 1, 40.7% of total conversational turns, group 2, 45.9%, see Table 2), both transcripts showed relatively long turns, resulting in a high percent of relational behaviors. Members in group 2 [Curt, Cary, Jeff, and Amie] had especially long conversational turns, as the following excerpt shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jeff:</td>
<td>well, firstly, or secondly you have to have your MLA documentation, you know, include in your bibliography and most of your quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Amie:</td>
<td>yep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jeff:</td>
<td>should be under that proper form of documentation. I think you have to have a clear thesis statement. You ah, let's, just, state it at the beginning of the piece, say, make it clear and concise and to the point, and then at the end, again state your thesis and make sure that your audience knows exactly what you're talking about. I feel the organization needs to be well in this paper. You need to, your paragraphs must flow smoothly together with a good opening topic sentence of each paragraph and a good transition between each paragraph. . . . And also multiple views I feel are important in a paper such as this. . . where we have to address both sides of the argument so that the audience could say, by review of the topic that that you're trying to discuss. . . and, that's about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cary:</td>
<td>//well I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amie:</td>
<td>//wait a minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cary:</td>
<td>also there should be some good mechanics in the paper too, you gotta, you know make sure you get your periods and your documenation thingamibobs all straight so you, ah, are correct. Plus I think you oughta have the, the grammar side of it also oughta be, at least understandable and readable, and you know it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amie:</td>
<td>ok, out and also we have to use ethos in your paper. By that I mean to be knowledgable about your topic, and you must also demonstrate fairness and talk about all the views, um , there may be more than just the one or two views ah, you need to elaborate on all the views. Also you need to build a bridge to the audience. These three things will establish ethos in your paper. . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S Curt: I think that's pretty good. One more thing, you have to be sure to get across your views on the topic and not just summarize everybody else's.

I find it interesting that the conversational turns in group 2 were longer (resembling a singly developed conversational floor according to Edelsky) and that group 2 displayed few naming comments. Could there be a correlation between length of turns and use of naming comments? Although naming comments could possibly function to maintain an F2 collaborative discussion floor and therefore diminish conversational dominance, this study does not address a possible correlation between length of turns and use of naming comments. Perhaps future studies can investigate the relationship between length of turns and frequency of naming comments.

Unlike group 2, members in group 1 [Don, Elliot, Tania, Tina] had short conversational turns. Though group 1 also had few naming comments, the

### Table 4

**Groups with low-level relational interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># of Tums</th>
<th>Use of relational behaviors</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Singer (S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Bierman (L)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania George (G)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Thomsen (K)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Park (G)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Hammon (V)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Currier (W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amie Barch (U)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M/F= Male/Female  
N= Naming  
P= Positioning  
S= Supporting  
R=Reciprocating
The majority of relational behaviors for both groups 1 and 2 was positioning; neither group showed strong naming comments (see Table 4). Group 1 has comments only in naming and positioning categories and no comments in any other categories. Group 2 similarly displayed behaviors in positioning, a few in naming, and one in supporting. These groups show a low use of relational comments (particularly of naming comments). Because of this low distribution and lack of naming behaviors, I label them as low-level interactive groups that do not display collaborative leadership.

**High-level interaction groups**

Groups 3-8 show a greater frequency of naming behaviors and relational behaviors overall than groups 1 and 2 (see Table 5). Rather than discuss each group individually, I highlight interesting observations and excerpts from groups that I feel display particularly strong collaborative leadership. I discuss the overall use of relational behaviors for these groups in addition to their use of naming comments.
Group 6 displayed the highest percent of relational behaviors (54.6%) of all eight groups. Of the three members in that group [Jane, Rick, and Jim], Rick displayed 50% of the group's relational behaviors. Of that 50%, most behaviors were naming, followed by positioning. Jim displayed the second highest percentage of relational behaviors (33%), the majority of which were naming comments, followed by positioning comments. Jane, the third member of the group, displayed only 17% of the group's relational behaviors, with the majority being positioning comments. This group showed a high variety of relational behaviors. Group 6 was the only group that had a percentage of naming comments that was higher than positioning comments. The following excerpt demonstrates the variety of relational behaviors [(N), (S), (P)] typically displayed by members in group 6.

N Jane: OK, we'll start with minimum tillage. . . . To me, ok, to me this paper was kind of boring . . . . What did you think about it.

S Rick: Well good point. The topic itself wasn't one that most people were going to find very interesting. Um, his opening paragraph isn't very stimulating or catching in any kinda way to his audience. . . . It was very dull throughout, I thought. Jim?

Jim: One of my personal pet peaves that really erked me off when I read this paper was after looking through at all the ah, oh, what do you call em..

Jane: documentation

P Rick: ah, yes, of course

P Jim: documentation. Internal documentation, almost his entire paper was plagiarized.

S,N Rick: Good point, Jim.

In other places in the transcript of group 6, both Jim and Rick displayed the majority of relational behaviors. Jim solicited the opinions of others and supported others in the group. Rick also made frequent use of questions and
Table 5
Groups with high-level relational interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># of Use of relational behaviors</th>
<th>Tums</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kari Acres (C)</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynn Edmund (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randy Rane (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hendricks (Y)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Klean (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tasha Linnen (T)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Gratner (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Henderson (Z)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Erica Allen (M)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Brian (O)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Stange (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Grand (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jane Hine (H)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Myer (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Lyon (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marie Christofson (P)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Brock (Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Handen (J)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scott Winter (R)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corbett Shindle (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Lukins (V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cori Thea (Y)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M/F= Male/Female   N= Naming   P= Positioning   S= Supporting   R= Reciprocating

naming ("What do you think, Jane?") consistently throughout. Jane's position in this group was not dominant. The only naming comment she made was the one in the excerpt above. Jane generally engaged in relational behaviors only when encouraged to do so by Rick or Jim, as seen in the following excerpt:
Jim: Just penetrating. OK, let's go on to, why don't you give me what you think a good criteria is.

Jane: I think one would be if we include the writer's point of view (laugh). Because this is important in any paper if we want to make it a good paper.

Rick: Well Jim, the 10 sources was important but, however, I don't think it's the most important.

Jim: I never said it was. I just started us off. I started the ball rolling.

Rick: OK, well ah, Jane had a good point, the writer's point of view. We don't want to ah use the other author's ah, own words, which is another important aspect of our papers. Um, I would say organization would be the ah most important. Do you agree?

Jane: Yes. that's an important fact too I guess.

Rick: Well thank you. Um, and also thesis is a very important ah part of our criteria for our... .

Jane did not often speak up on her own unless it was to support the opinions of Rick or Jim. That Rick and Jim encouraged her to participate by using naming relational behaviors exemplifies the idea of collaborative leadership. The use of their relational, encouraging behaviors allowed Jane to contribute to the conversation.

With the exception of group 6, all other high-level interaction groups displayed the highest percent of relational behaviors in positioning, followed by naming comments. Whereas in group 6 the highest number of behaviors was displayed by the two males in the group, in group 7 (with a total of 49.1% relational behaviors) the highest percent of relational behaviors was displayed by Jamie and Marie, the two females in the group. Jamie displayed the highest percentage of relational behaviors (48%); the majority of her comments were positioning comments. Marie had the second highest percentage (36%); the majority of her comments were also positioning comments. Tom had the lowest percent of relational behaviors (16%) in the group, with comments being divided between positioning and naming. Tom played a role in group 7 similar to the
role Jane played in group 6. He was not as active as Marie or Jamie and participated when his opinion was solicited.

Marie: um, I did on paper for knowledge calls for freedom what to you want to say, like what we ranked it and why?

P Jamie: yep

Marie: kay I thought it deserved a 1. And [interruption]

N Jamie: What about O? Or do you agree?

Tom: um, I think I gave that one a 2.

Jamie: Ok, I gave it a 1. So why would it rather be [unintelligible] laugh

Examples of conversational behavior displayed by Tom and Jane demonstrate the need and the benefit of relational behavior for collaborative leadership. The naming comments made by others in the group encouraged Tom and Jane to contribute their opinions to the group. It is also interesting to note (because of the previous discussion on gender) that in group 7, the other two female members encouraged Tom to contribute through naming behaviors, while in group 6, the other two male members used naming behaviors to encourage Jane to join. In other words, gender did not determine the display of relational behavior in these cases. Rather, relational behavior (and naming in particular) was used for the purpose of including others in the group's discussion.

The richest display of naming and positioning comments is demonstrated by group 3 members: Kari, Lynn, Randy, John, and Ron. Members in this group demonstrated frequent interaction and a distribution of relational behaviors in these two categories. Group 3 displayed the highest number of positioning comments and had the highest number of conversational turns. This group also had the highest number of naming comments, displayed most often by John (with 35 naming comments) and by Kari (with 15 naming comments), both of whom seemed to display strong contributions to leadership in the group. Note
in the following excerpt how Kari and John solicit response from others in the
group and how interaction rapidly shifts from member to member.

N Kari: so, what do we think on this paper A.
N John: What do we, what do we give it?
Ron: um
Kari: I say 2.

P,N John: I say 2. Come on, Randy, you're the stick in the mud here.
Randy: I liked it.
N John: Randy says two.
P Lynn: two.
N John: say it, Randy.
P Randy: two.
P John: so we all give it a two. //You like that answer? I thought you would.
P Ron: //I don't think it's a two.
N Kari: Do you not think it's a two?
Randy: I don't know.
Ron: Can I see the paper?
N Kari: You think it's a one?
John: If you think it's better you need to support it.
Randy: Well I think it's better than the other one
Kari: Well yeah, but with all these criteria it doesn't meet all these very
criteria to its fullest.

Interaction among members in group 3 illustrates how distributed relational
behaviors contribute to leadership. Group members were actively asking
questions, referring to others, listening to ideas, and contributing their opinions.
The use of relational behaviors in conversation yielded a positive environment
in which members felt free to contribute.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMPLICATIONS: RELATIONAL BEHAVIORS AS THE VOICE OF COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

I have conducted this descriptive study of collaborative leadership in order to explore the following question: "How do relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership in small group interaction?" My investigation is a specific response to the larger issue of how gender labels influence the view of leadership, as articulated in Meg Morgan’s assertion that female leaders are often not recognized. I have narrowed my focus to a study of relational behaviors—behaviors that have been previously described in research as relational, interpersonal, female, and powerless in comparison to task-oriented, dominant, male, and powerful behaviors. By applying four categories of relational behaviors to eight student group transcripts, I have attempted to explore, among the eight student groups I observed (1) whether or not relational behaviors exist in student small group interaction; (2) whether or not relational behaviors are used more by women than by men; and (3) whether or not the use of relational behaviors contributes to an open discussion environment and, in turn, contributes to a collaborative style of leadership in student small groups.

Relational behaviors exist in small groups observed for this study

As results from chapter four show, relational behaviors exist in the interaction of eight small groups observed for this study. An average of 40% of all conversational turns (in all transcripts combined) contain relational
behaviors as described by my coding scheme. In only two of the eight groups was the use of relational behaviors lower than 40 percent (groups 5 and 8).

Results from this study, however, cannot be generalized for all student groups. For example, other student groups may not display a high use of relational behaviors. The frequency of relational behaviors in a student group can also be affected by the nature of its task. That is to say, the type of task may affect the type of interaction and the use of relational behaviors. For example, a task that requires group members to tell stories about themselves may yield a higher use of connecting behaviors than a task that requires group members to rank student composition papers. Much like the belief that language is relative to context (expressed by Deborah Tannen), the use of relational behaviors may be relative to context. Future studies can explore the affect of context on the use of relational behaviors. However, regardless of how often or in what contexts relational behaviors are used, I advocate that group members recognize and value relational behaviors for establishing an open discussion environment.

**Relational behaviors are used by women and men**

From my study of eight small groups for a first-year English composition class, I conclude that, among the participating students, relational behaviors are used by males and females near equally; therefore, among the students that participated in my study, relational behaviors are not an exclusive female behavior. These results suggest that binary descriptions of male and female speech behavior do not adequately describe the use of male and female language. My results concur with current research that promotes androgynous behavior as effective communication. In accordance with research discussed earlier (Bem
1978; Edelsky 1981; Smeltzer and Werbel 1986; Lay 1989; Tannen 1993), I assert that labels of male dominance and female powerlessness are inaccurate to describe the language used by men and women. Rather, I argue that men and women use a variety of speech behaviors appropriate to situation. I believe that my results demonstrate that, for the participating students, speech behaviors once categorized by gender are used by both men and women, and that the use of relational behaviors, considered powerless in past research (Lakoff 1975; Baird 1976; Fishman 1978; Gilligan 1982; Maltz and Borker 1982; West and Zimmerman 1983; Wetzel 1988), contribute to an open discussion environment.

As mentioned above, I conclude that for the eight student groups in this study, binary descriptions of male and female speech behavior do not adequately describe the use of male and female language. I do not assert that the results show an obvious connection between gender and collaborative leadership. The link from collaborative leadership to gender is a delicate one. As I reported earlier, previous research on gender and communication characterizes female speech as weak and male speech as dominant. I argue that female speech behaviors such as relational behaviors, although they have not been assigned value as high as task-oriented behavior, can be just as essential to leadership. One could easily associate female leaders with labels of weakness due to past research which values male speech behavior more than female speech behavior. To make this association cheats females and males of recognition, value, and worth as leaders. If anything, I believe my results show that, for the participating students in this study, males and females use behaviors once categorized as typically female. Consequently, because I agree with current research that advocates the use of behaviors regardless of the male or female labels assigned to
them, I am happy to see that my results show an androgynous use of speech behavior in small groups, and I am excited about exploring the implications of androgynous use of speech behavior in future research.

**Relational behaviors may contribute to collaborative leadership**

I have concluded that my study does not completely answer the question "How do relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership?" While the results of my study tentatively suggest that relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership, the entire topic of collaborative leadership needs further investigation. First, the definition of collaborative leadership needs to be refined. Second, while my study describes the amount of use of relational behaviors, I have no way to measure how relational behaviors contribute to collaborative leadership or how successful that leadership is. While this investigation yields a description of interaction involving behaviors that encourage participation of all members, it does not indicate how these relational interactions contribute to a style of collaborative leadership. This remains an area of future research.

Although my results alone do not determine how relational behaviors contribute to a type of collaborative leadership, this study does, however, describe categories of relational behavior and their use by students in small groups in an academic setting. Results from this study show that naming and positioning comments are prevalent in group interaction. Examples from student groups show that naming comments function to direct and include others in discussion, while positioning comments voice student opinions about previous comments made by other group members. Through the use of relational behaviors (such as
naming), members in a group are given a chance to contribute to group discussion as others invite, encourage, and welcome member input. In principle, opening conversation to all group members diminishes domination of conversation by one group member.

It is my hope that the use of relational behaviors promotes the building of a collaborative "F2 floor" as described by Carole Edelsky. Edelsky suggests that a collaboratively built floor diminishes conversational domination by encouraging all members to contribute to discussion. In accordance with Edelsky, I argue that a collaborative conversational floor can allow the voices of all members to be heard. Future research can describe perhaps more completely how relational behaviors accomplish that goal.

Implications for pedagogy

The observations made from this study have implications for pedagogy: (1) collaborative leadership offers an alternative method for instructing collaborative work and (2) the promotion of collaborative leadership and relational behaviors may encourage reluctant students to voice their opinions, ideas, and thoughts in the classroom.

Collaborative leadership: an alternative method for working collaboratively

The classroom provides a prime environment for group collaborative tasks, projects, and assignments. Teachers can offer students the opportunity to work in groups by assigning group projects, which in turn allows students to experience communicating with others in a task-oriented environment. To
introduce a method of collaborative work, teachers can provide students with a list of relational behaviors or inform students about the principle behind collaborative leadership (include all group members in the discussion). If it is possible, instructors can greatly benefit by sitting in on group interactions or conferencing with groups. Observing group interactions will allow teachers to detect problems with groups in which members do not feel encouraged or invited to participate. In these situations, instructors can advise the use of relational behaviors in order to encourage member participation.


Using relational behaviors to voice opinions and thoughts

Applying feminist pedagogical methods explores the use of collaboration in the classroom. Collaboration de-centers the instructor and centers the student; therefore, collaborative exercises encourage students quite literally to find their voices. In other words, collaboration in the classroom provides a medium for student-centered learning. The feminist perspective enhances not only the
argument that group work is useful but also the argument that relational skills are important in interaction. Feminism, in promoting discovery of "voice," also promotes listening and responding to the voices of others. The relational or webbing behaviors I have described actualize these goals by creating an environment that encourages discussion of ideas. By soliciting the ideas of others, relational behavior requires that group members listen to others' ideas and respond to them.

**Future research**

As I have indicated, some research on female and male communication differences has often categorized speech characteristics of males and females and given them what many researchers believe are inaccurate labels of dominance and powerlessness. Other research recognizes the value of relational behaviors, at one time considered powerless, for effective communication. This study has been conducted with the intent to contribute to this recognition. Furthermore, I have intended to promote the use of relational behaviors in group interaction. Future research can: (1) explore the role of relational behaviors for leadership in small group communication; and (2) explore the value of relational behaviors in small group interaction in different contexts.

Future research could explore the direct implications this study has for leadership in small group communication. For example, leadership skills reportedly include task and relational behaviors (Barge 21), and current theories of "leadership as medium" (this view de-centers leaders and sees leadership as a vehicle) assert that leaders "develop a repertoire of message strategies that can be adapted to the unique qualities of different situations" (Barge 25). As
collaborative leadership is further defined in future research, it could be compared or contribute to these current theories of leadership.

Future research could also explore the value of relational behaviors for small group interaction. Future studies may document the use of relational behaviors in a variety of small group contexts other than student groups in order to explore whether or not these behaviors are used by both men and women. Perhaps future research could indicate whether the use of relational behaviors is widespread or proven to be an effective communication skill in small group interaction.

It is my hope that traditionally labeled female communication skills have been awarded their rightful value for professional communication. Meg Morgan has asserted that the "... likelihood that a woman will perform the tasks of a leader is great, but the likelihood of her being called a leader is not" (218). As future research promotes the value of relational, interpersonal skills for professional communication, perhaps women leaders will receive the recognition they have earned.
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APPENDIX A
DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS

English 105 Criteria Setting
Task

Part 1 Max amount of tape time: 10 minutes

Part of your group work for the rest of the semester will be to develop lists of criteria for your paper assignments. Those of you who were in class when we developed criteria lists for Paper #5 know that this is not a difficult task. For Paper #6, I would like your groups to meet OUTSIDE OF CLASS and develop a list of evaluation criteria, using the assignment sheet for Paper #6. You may add criteria that is not included on the assignment sheet, but most of all I would like you to list the important criteria that are imbedded in the assignment sheet. After you have listed the criteria, then rank order them (1 being most important). I would like you to tape record this session. You will not get this tape back. There should be only one tape per group. We will discuss in class the criteria your groups come up with and establish a collective list.

Part 2 Max amount of tape time: 30 min

The second thing I would like your group to do OUTSIDE OF CLASS is look at three papers and rank them according to how well they fit the criteria you have previously established. In other words, you get to be the graders. Don’t assign letter grades, but just rank them as to how well they fit the criteria (1 being best, 3 being worst). I would like you to tape record this session as well. You should read the papers before you meet with your group and be prepared to discuss them.
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF SOURCE PAPER

English 105

Source Paper

Argument using at least 10 sources
10-15 pages (double spaced), + Bibliography

Special note - For the rough draft workshop, it is imperative that you bring 2 copies of a typed rough draft.

Assignment

Construct an argument for a point of view in which you use at least 10 sources for support/ reason/ opposing points of view. Basically, this paper is an extension of Paper #4, even if you have changed your topic. What you need to do is write an argument that is more in depth than Paper #4 was. From doing the Annotated Bibliography, you now have a good idea what your sources say about your topic. Now you need to use those sources to discuss your thesis statement.

Audience and Purpose

The purpose of the source paper is to construct a well thought out argument which incorporates the sources you have found on your topic. The audience is up to you. You may want to limit the audience to our English 105 class, or you may want the audience to be a particular group of people who are concerned about your issue (ie, address a paper on the Health Plan to a congressperson).

Thesis

Your thesis should be clear. In other words, it should be very easy to understand what you are arguing for. Ask yourself this question to help keep your focus: "What do I really want to say about this topic?" You now have collected information on what others had to say about the topic, now you must say something about the topic.

Sources

Your sources should present a variety of views on your topic. You should incorporate each source at least once in your paper (that is, you should have at least one internal citation for each source in your paper). This means that you must use the proper documentation form for internal and external documentation like we discussed in class (MLA !!). Be accurate in your use of direct quotes and paraphrases. And of course, you will want your paper to be free of mechanical and grammatical errors.

Organization will be important for this paper. Remember to keep your thesis in mind when using your sources. Ask yourself these questions: "How does this source relate to my thesis?" and "How can I use this source to support my thesis?" or "How can I refute this opposing point of view to support my thesis?"
APPENDIX C

HUMAN RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE FORM

Cover memo to inform subjects and request consent

December 2, 1993

To: English 105 students in sections A4 and D4
From: Lee-Ann Kastman
Subject: Consent to participate in research

I would like you to participate in research towards my Master’s thesis. One of the things we have done over the semester in English 105 is group work. I would like to examine the effectiveness of group work in an English composition classroom setting. My research question is: How does group interaction assist task completion? Here is some more information on how you may participate in my study.

In addition to writing a review of literature relevant to group interaction and task completion, I will investigate my research question by examining group interactions of English 105 students as certain tasks are completed. I will collect data by having students tape record specific tasks and transcribing these recordings. I will conduct a follow-up questionnaire-based interview of selected subjects only.

Time needed. Groups must meet outside of class to tape record the assigned task for English 105. The task involves two parts. Part 1 should be about 10 minutes of tape recording, and Part 2 should be about 30 minutes of tape recording. The follow-up interview (for students asked to interview) will take about one hour.

Location of the research study. Students must meet outside of class to tape record the assigned task. The groups must negotiate a place to do the recording. Interviews will be conducted in my office, Landscape Architecture Room 5.

Confidentiality. I will ensure confidentiality by using pseudonyms when interpreting this research.

Identifier codes. No identifier codes will be assigned to subjects; pseudonyms will be assigned to protect subjects’ identities.
**Future contact**  Future contact beyond the end of English 105 class and participation with tape recordings will not be expected unless students are asked to participate in a follow-up interview. If students are asked to interview, they will be contacted in the beginning of Spring term 1994.

**Voluntary participation**  Participation in this research project is voluntary; nonparticipation will not effect evaluations.

**Giving consent**  If you are willing to participate in this research, please read, sign, and return the enclosed consent form. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

**Consent to participate in research: for subjects**

Lee-Ann Kastman  
206 Ross Hall  
294-8358 or 292-5903

I agree to participate in this research conducted by Lee-Ann Kastman. I understand that portions of transcribed tapes involving my participation in group task completion may be included in the academic or professional writing by Lee-Ann Kastman. If I am asked to be interviewed, I understand that I will be contacted in the beginning of Spring semester 1994 and that the interview will last about an hour. I understand that all subjects and incidental individuals will be referred to by pseudonym and that the identities of all research subjects will be protected. I understand that there is no risk associated with this research, that the researcher will freely answer any inquiries about her research methods, that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time, and that the researcher may use my data in research without prejudice at any time.

*Signed*  ________________________________

*Date*  ________________________________

*Name*  ________________________________

*Address*  ________________________________

*Phone*  ________________________________
Information sheet covering the eight points regarding informed consent: for the Human Subjects Review Committee

1. Procedures include analysis of transcribed tape recordings of English 105 student group interaction in task completion, and individual questionnaire-based interviews with selected students.

2. There are no foreseeable discomforts or risks.

3. Benefits include furthering research on group work and the effectiveness of interaction towards task completion. Hopefully, the results will illuminate ways to improve group interaction in an English 105 class setting. Subjects may have an appreciation for group work and understand better how people interact in group settings to complete tasks.

4. Not applicable

5. In addition to the statement on the consent form, I will answer any questions students may have if they are asked to participate in an interview.

6. In addition to the statement on the consent form, for those interviewing I will again state that the person can withdraw their consent without prejudice.

7. In addition to the statement on the consent form, I will assure them that their identities will be protected.

8. I anticipate that the outside of class tape recordings will take a total of 40 minutes. Follow-up interviews for selected students will take about an hour.
Description of task to be tape recorded
(As the task was presented to the students)

English 105 Criteria Setting Task

Part 1 Max amount of tape time: 10 minutes

Part of your group work for the rest of the semester will be to develop lists of criteria for your paper assignments. Those of you who were in class when we developed criteria lists for Paper #5 know that this is not a difficult task. For Paper #6, I would like your groups to meet OUTSIDE OF CLASS and develop a list of evaluation criteria, using the assignment sheet for Paper #6. You may add criteria that is not included on the assignment sheet, but most of all I would like you to list the important criteria that are imbedded in the assignment sheet. After you have listed the criteria, then rank order them (1 being most important). I would like you to tape record this session. You will not get this tape back. There should be only one tape per group. We will discuss in class the criteria your groups come up with and establish a collective list.

Part 2 Max amount of tape time: 30 min

The second thing I would like your group to do OUTSIDE OF CLASS is look at three papers and rank them according to how well they fit the criteria you have previously established. In other words, you get to be the graders. Don’t assign letter grades, but just rank them as to how well they fit the criteria (1 being best, 3 being worst). I would like you to tape record this session as well. You should read the papers before you meet with your group and be prepared to discuss them.

This task will not be graded. However, this task will be worth 25 points of the 100 point final. Please turn in the tape at our final exam meeting.
Sample follow-up interview questions (one hour interviews to be held in the beginning of spring semester 1994)

Please describe how your group completed the assigned task.

How satisfied were you with the way your group completed the assigned task?

What group behaviors were most helpful in completing the task (listening, staying on task, questioning, cooperating, discussing, etc)?

Were there any difficulties your group faced as you completed the task? If so, what kind of difficulties did your group face and how were they resolved?

How was your group led to task completion? Did a leader emerge or did several people share leadership responsibilities?

What group behaviors would you consider to be leadership behaviors that helped lead the group to task completion?

What role do you feel you played in the group (contributor, listener, recorder, leader, emotional supporter, etc)?
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CO-RATERS

Task: code 4 transcripts for relational behaviors

Plan: 1) meet with you to discuss and explain coding system
      2) practice coding system with me (one)
      3) practice coding system on your own (one)
      4) code two transcripts on your own (two)

Included is background information about the study, description of subjects, tasks, and coding system. Please note in the margins any questions you have.

Description of English 105 classes

English 105 is an introductory argumentative writing course in a two semester sequence of first year writing courses at Iowa State University. As instructor I designed coursework in English 105 to help students learn to read, understand, analyze, doubt, and use outside sources to build an argument on a controversial topic. Being an English 105 instructor allowed me to study group interaction in the two classes I taught. The students in the classes were primarily first-year students. There were a few sophomores and one junior in the two classes (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>First-year students</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much of the class involved group work. I divided and assigned each class into six groups in which students would work for the rest of the semester on a variety of group projects including peer response workshops, discussion questions, and collaborative planning. Each group met five times during the semester for peer response workshops, one time outside of class for formulating discussion questions on an assigned set of essays, and two times for collaborative planning (one time in class, and one time outside of class, tape recorded). Because many group projects (with the same group) were required during the semester, students were very familiar with the members in their group by the end of the semester.

Design of the study

The English 105 group project that was tape recorded for the purposes of this study was assigned late in the semester as part of the required coursework. The project required groups to review drafts of argument papers written for the same course; it was designed to help them prepare for their final argument papers for the course. Groups completed two tasks: 1) Criteria Setting - students developed a list of criteria to evaluate a comprehensive source paper (a ten page research paper that was their final project of the semester). For the source paper, students were asked to write an argument about a controversial topic and use ten sources (presenting multiple views on the issue) as support for their argument. 2) Evaluation - after developing a list of criteria, groups read a cluster of three source papers and evaluated them on the basis of the criteria they had listed
(clusters are described in Figure 1). A description of the task and the source paper assignment sheet have been included (see Figure 2 and Figure 3 enclosed).

**Figure 1: Papers discussed by groups**

*Cluster 1 (written by students in Class A, evaluated by Class B)*

- Minimum Tillage Farming
- The Death Penalty
- Reintroduction of the Wolf to Yellowstone

*Cluster 2 (written by students in Class B, evaluated by Class A)*

- Save the Spotted Owl
- Censorship of Books
- Overpopulation

Each student group discussed only one cluster of papers. All groups were given the cluster of papers written by students in the opposite class for maximum objectivity. For example, Class A students were asked to review papers in Cluster 2, written by students in Class B. I thought discussion of papers would be more objective if the readers did not personally know the author.

The two tasks (criteria setting and evaluation) were assigned to groups as a final project. Students were aware that this project would be used for my study and were given the option of not participating in the study. Though participating students were aware that the tapes of their interaction would be used in my thesis, they were not aware that I would be analyzing their transcripts
for leadership or interactional behaviors. All students whose work or interaction has been used for this study have signed Human Subject Participant Forms to grant permission for use of student participation. (See Appendix for a copy of the form approved by ISU Human Subjects Committee.)

**Collaborative Leadership**

In response to the original research question (*Do "webbing" or "relational" behaviors indicate leadership in group interaction?*), I argue that relational behaviors in small group communication indicate a different type of leadership—leadership that is constructed through group interaction. Collaborative leadership creates an encouraging environment in which members feel free to contribute to discussion. This type of leadership relies upon relational or webbing behaviors demonstrated by one or more group members that display a concern for others' opinions and invite participation of all members.

Based on my analysis of eight student groups, I have developed a list of relational behaviors for group work that indicate collaborative leadership in groups. I noticed from the data provided by the participating eight student groups that certain speech patterns consistently occurred throughout interaction. These reoccurring speech behaviors were interpersonal in nature by naming other group members, opening the floor of conversation to others, referring to previous comments made by other group members, and encouraging or supporting other group members. These interpersonal comments directly refer to people; hence the categories of relational behaviors I have developed focus on comments that refer to or address other group members. I found it curious that male and female students used these speech behaviors in group interaction, and
that the consistent use of relational behaviors seemed to move the group along in the progression of task. Though relational behaviors were displayed either by one or many group members, they seemed to signal leadership in the group. I have outlined five categories of relational behavior (more complete descriptions and examples follow).

**Categories of relational behavior**

(1) *Naming*—direct the conversation or refer back to a comment that was previously made

(3) *Positioning comments*—respond by taking a stand on an idea; either agreeing or disagreeing

(4) *Supporting comments*—encourage another group member (often through compliments)

(5) *Reciprocating*—show courtesy and politeness to another group member

These categories were developed to categorize comments that refer to or express a concern or acknowledgment of *people* in group interaction.
Features of speech that indicate connectedness in groups

1. Naming (N)

Naming comments can direct conversation by explicitly soliciting the opinion or comment of another specific group member. They often may direct the comment to another group member by naming them. Directives can also be illustrated through pronouns, including commands in the form of "(you) understood":

Ex. What do you think, Jen? (solicitation)
Ex. John, you haven't said anything yet. (solicitation)
Ex. I think you should respond to this. (directive)
Ex. Read the next example. ("you" understood - directive)

Naming can also open the floor of conversation by addressing the group. Questions that address the group as "we" open participation to any group member. These examples must include the pronoun "we" and clearly open the floor of conversation to any group member.

Ex. What do we think?
Ex. What should we do next?

Do not include questions that indirectly open the floor to the group. Only include questions that open the floor of conversation by addressing a group member or the group as "we."

DO NOT COUNT
Next?

So the final decision is what?

Naming does not include directives or commands addressed to the group.

DO NOT COUNT

Let's move on.

**Bridging (a subcategory of naming) (B)**

Bridging comments are naming comments that exclusively refer to a previous comment in conversation. Bridging comments must name the member (by pronoun or by name) that contributed the previous comment. These comments do not evaluate the previous comment but simply refer to it.

*Ex.* What Bob said earlier was really interesting.

*Ex.* It's just like what Becky was talking about a minute ago.

*Ex.* Laura, I don't understand what you just said.

Referrals can also bridge to the speaker or to the group as a collective "we":

*Ex.* I said that earlier...

*Ex.* We already said that, didn't we?

Referrals count as bridging comments only. They are a subcategory of naming comments; therefore they are only coded as "B" and not "B and N" (by being coded as a "B" comment they are included as an "N" comment).

Bridging can include a single reference to another group member by naming that member without directing the conversation to that group member.
Name referrals (or pronoun referrals) acknowledge other group members and therefore are included as bridging comments because they draw interpersonal attention to group members.

Ex. Well, Jim, I think that the paper should be third.

Bridging statements may be double coded if a name is included in the statement:

Ex. Thank you, Linda. ("Thank you" is a supporting comment)

2. Positioning

Group members may take a stance on a comment, idea, or opinion another group member has initiated. Positioning statements are responses and can be either positive or negative. Positioning comments are not evaluative comments; they simply indicate the position on an idea.

Agreement (P)

Ex. I agree with you.

Ex. Right. Exactly.

Positioning statements that are agreements can take the form of repetition of an exact phrase by another member:

Ex. M: We need to talk about bibliography.

Y: bibliography, yes, we need to talk about bibliography.

Do not count repetitions that agree with statements made more than 3-4 lines earlier in the transcript.
DO NOT COUNT

Ex.  M: We need to talk about bibliography.
    Y: and we need to talk about documentation.
    Z: documentation, yes.
    Y: What shall we say about documentation?
    Z: We need to talk about bibliography.

Agreement can be displayed in only one word or phrase:

(19) M: I think paper A is the best one.
    Y: yes.

The word "yes" may not always signal agreement. Do not count the word yes when it is only an answer to a question.

DO NOT COUNT

Ex.  M: Have you read this paper yet?
    Y: yes.

The word "yeah" can also signal agreement in the same way that "yes" does. Count "yeah" as a relational behavior only when it signals agreement with an idea, not when it is spoken as an answer to a question (like above) or as filler in conversation. As filler, words like "yeah" and "um hmm" may fill in spots of conversation (also called backchanneling). Do not count "yeah" or "um hmm" as agreement when you think it only serves to fill in conversation.

DO NOT COUNT
Ex.  M: 'cause those points are important but still
   Y: yeah
   T: yeah, well, you should know them, I mean

DO count "yeah" when you have a strong sense that it is spoken as an agreement. Yeah may often be followed by a supporting comment to indicate agreement.

(22) M: I know you said use 10 sources but that's not the list,
   Y: yeah, that's just general guidelines.

Or agreement can be expressed in a rewording of a previous member's phrase:

Ex.  M: We need to look at organization next.
   Y: Organization should be before documentation, yes.

Do not count statements that add on to a previous thought as agreement.

DO NOT COUNT
   Ex.  M: We need to talk about bibliography.
         Y: The bibliography should have 10 sources.

Note: Repetitions in the positioning category must illustrate agreement for another's idea.

Disagreement (-P)

Positioning statements can also be disagreements. Disagreements count as relational behavior because they acknowledge and connect with comments made previously by other group members.
Ex. Well, Jeff, the 10 sources was important but however I don't think it's the most important."
Ex. Oh, I disagree totally.
Ex. No, I don't think that is right.

Disagreements must be explicit. If it is difficult to identify a disagreement, don't count it.

DO NOT COUNT
Ex. Yeah, but...
Ex. Well, I think instead that...

3. Supporting (S)

Supporting comments give encouragement or praise to another group member, often in the form of compliments. Supportive comments are positive evaluations, but do not necessarily indicate a position or stance. For example, a member could really like a previous comment but not necessarily agree with it. In most cases, supporting comments do indicate agreement.

Ex. Good job, Beth.
Ex. That was a smart comment you made about the last paper.
Ex. I really liked what you said a minute ago.
Ex. Good point, but I don't agree with you.
Comments in this category may be double coded with category 2, bridging, because they often refer to previous comments. Using the same examples, bridging is indicated in italics:

Ex. That was a smart comment you made about the last paper.
Ex. I really liked what you said a minute ago.
Ex. Good point, but I don’t agree with you.

4. Reciprocity (R)

These comments show courtesy toward other group members. They can be in response to compliments like the above statements in #4, and often may have a name attached to the acceptance.

Ex. Why thank you, Barbara.
Ex. Thank you for saying that.
Ex. You’re welcome.

I am limiting this category to comments that explicitly demonstrate courtesy phrases such as "please" and "thank you" and "you're welcome." I am aware that literature on compliments and politeness is extensive and interpretation of compliments is complex. Yet I include this category because I feel that explicit courtesy statements serve to create an environment in which members feel free to contribute.
Rationale for categories

All five categories were designed to identify explicit interpersonal comments in interaction. The above five categories focus on people skills in task-oriented groups; it is my argument that collaborative leadership depends upon these relational comments. These categories refer to people in that they invite group members to participate in discussion and they refer to previous comments that group members have made. Relational comments open the conversational floor rather than allow one person to monopolize the conversation.
Sample Transcript

In the following excerpt, three group members (indicated by the letters M, H, and B) are discussing a list of criteria. Relational behaviors are underlined and in bold face. Numbers in the left margin next to underlined passages correspond to the categories of relational behavior that I have outlined: (1) directives; (2) bridging; (3) positioning; (4) supporting; and (5) reciprocating.

M: ...OK. For part one, for task one of our tape, tape for final exam, we are going to discuss our criteria, for paper 6. We may add criteria that is not included on the assignment sheet. ... We will not get this tape back. (laugh) Ok let's start. I think one of the most important criterias of this was the 10 sources. Because for our annotated bibliography we had to have 10 sources. And I think our paper should include the 10 sources that we used for our annotated bibliography. Do you agree with me?

H: Yes.

M: Why?

H: Because we went to all the work for the annotated bibliography. We should use it all in our=

M: It was hard work, wasn't it.

H: Yes.

M: Did you think it was hard work?

R: Yes, I did.

M: Just penetrating. OK, let's go on to, why don't you give me what you think a good criteria is.

H: I think one would be if we include the writer's point of view (laugh). Because this is important in any paper if we want to make it a good paper...

R: Well M, the 10 sources was important but however I don't think it's the most important.

M: I never said it was. I just started us off. I started the ball rolling.

R: OK, well ah, H had a good point, the writer's point of view. We don't want to ah use the other author's ah, own words, which is another important aspect of our papers. Um, I would say organization would be the ah most important. Do you agree?

H: That's an important fact too I guess.

R: Well thank you, Um, and also thesis is a very important ah part of our criteria for our paper. And ah, we don't contradict our thesis throughout. M, ah, what do you think?

M: I agree with what you said. The writer's point of view, excuse me, I was just drinking, the writer's point of view is very important to using this. I think another very, and probably one of the most important things, is the thesis... The thesis?

R: Why is that, M?

M: I think the thesis is important because um, when you have the, the author's thesis, that sets the tone of the entire paper, and their paper has to match their thesis. So if they say they don't agree with the topic like abortion, then their whole paper has to deal with that. So one, small statement can affect an entire person's paper.

R: Good.
Group 1

Group members: Class A
Tina (K), Elliot (L), Tania (F), Don (S)

Begin task one. Counter at 0.

S: First of all, I mean, right off the bat we said it was gonna be like 10 sources
L: //10 sources
K: //10 sources
L: 10 sources
K: we have to document 10 sources
S: document 10 sources, and it's gotta be on a controversial subject more than one view
K: more than one view
L: alright, ok
K: needs to be in MLA form
L: with proper grammar. um......
K: clear thesis
L: clear thesis
K: ah......
L: bibliography at the end
S: that's the, the
K: the list
S: yeah, the list. In proper form is important
L: ah...
S: you know obviously you've got to reflect the multiple viewpoints from your subject in your paper.
L: OK
K: that's true
S: it has to be very good, you know what I mean?
K: yeah, you have to address both sides of the issue?
S: yeah. I think that's more or less what I directed it to
L: your information has to relate to your thesis..
K: that's right.
S: that would be a good idea
K: that'd be good, though. //Stick to the topic
L: //wait until you read one of those, you'll get lost
K: You should stick to the topic
S: yeah
K: ah
S: I don't know how, it should be like organized, have transitions between your areas
K: yeah...
L: and
S: doesn't prove a point very well if it's all //jumbled up
L: //jumbled up....let's see.....
L: anything else.
K: ah.....let's see, all that stuff we've heard
S: I don't know, we have a nice healthy dose of silence in here
L: un huh
K: laugh. well we discussed the thesis, the sources,
S: yeah
K: the
S: I don't know like maybe the paper has to be fairly long
L: um hmm
K: it has to be long enough//to say
S: //if it's too short you're not going to be able to prove it very well, but
K: //but you don't want it so long
S: //you don't want it, =
L: well we could just say that your paper has to be convincing
S: yeah to be good
K: //you can't have a lot of unnecessary things in it
L: //convincing, yeah, and
S: oh, and make sure you document things that are not your own ideas
K: //yeah
L: //uh huh
K: and you have to have=
S: plagiarism is a bad idea
K: well you have to have a
S: especially if someone catches on to it
K: (laugh) you should document whatever you, you know you should have like something to back up your points
L: um hum
S: yeah, I mean, yeah, you'd have like, yeah. laugh
L: hm........
S: well maybe, give something of an organization in the introduction
K: yeah
L: uh huh
S: probably don't have to
K: we should be able to within the first few paragraphs or so know what stand you're taking to
S: oh, definitely
L: and it doesn't hurt to restate your thesis through the//paper
K: //throughout
S: //yeah that's probably a good idea. And you really don't, you know, don't have to // there are other ways to build up to it
K: //yeah, just, yeah. Refer back to it
S: yeah
silence
K: I think that's it
L: That's about it
S: yep.

End task one. Counter at 31.

Begin task two. Counter at 34.
L: Ok, how are we going to do this?
K: OK, I think the spotted owl should be last. It was really bad.
G: Yeah.
K: It doesn't talk about the spotted owl for half the paper. It, like, talks about jobs or something else, and he doesn't really know how to document, and I'm not really sure what his view is on the spotted owl. He just like, says—
L: Yeah, his documentation is really bad cuz he's got like commas in there. And this one documentation it says "1989 the spotted owl went on the threatened species list." Then it has the documentation Fisher 29. And then in the same sentence it says "In 1990 the US Fish and Wildlife service included the spotted owl under the Endangered Species Act" and then it has another documentation...um
K: I just didn't really find it all that—
G: I didn't really like that paper either cuz, I was lost in the whole thing (laugh). I really didn't understand which what he wanted to talk about.
K: Yeah, he rambled on, cuz he talked about and started out talking about the spotted owl. And basically all he gave was facts. And then like he started talking about jobs and work //and something like that
L: //Well, well he talks about. For a while...I can't decide if he's like for saving the spotted owl or against it cause here it says "The other thing the spotted owl is getting blamed for is the increase in the value of timber"...
K: Don't cover the mike
L: Oh, OK....
S: He like, started rambling on a little bit, and to that thing you know, it's just like
L: uh huh
S: and not until two paragraphs later does he actually say what that has to do with his paper
L: That's right, that's right.
S: Like toss out a bunch of facts, it's like, "OK.."
K: Yeah.
L: So this was just//nasty, just nasty.
K: //this didn't really. It--it was hard to follow.... I didn't understand it.... So.
L: But I, but his bibliography is pretty nice though. It looks like it's you know
K: that's true, it is
L: It's all there, and that's all documented, right? But the other parts aren't.
S: Yeah, well I don't know. It didn't like get the paper off on a good start. Like in the first paragraph in the introduction, his good old capitalization there
K: Oh yeah, he has like typos--
L: Yeah, it--
S: I mean, it's just like--
K: Well keep it in, this is a rough draft. So the typos, I don't know.
S: Yeah, I don't know, it's like serving, it's like...Hey, great paper! Huh! Look at that! It kind of gets things off on a bad foot.
L: The opening paragraph is kinda long too.
K: Yeah, it looks like a body paragraph.
S: Yeah.
L: And I don't know what his thesis statement is. I don't, you know... There's a part here that says......"Should the owl's habitat be set off limits to timber harvest and incur a variety of hardships for many people throughout the country, especially those directed in the Pacific Northwest, or should things be left along" and this sentence just goes on and on and on.
S: Ah, no doubt
L: At first you think that this could be his thesis statement.
K: Yeah, but it has both sides in it.
L: yeah
S: He's just like... I don't know, I mean, at least I understand that he says you have to agree with current policy which states that the owl should be protected. That more, or at least as much as (?) should decide a lot. Well, I mean, that makes it sound like, OK, the owl should be protected.
K: m h m m
S: But then he's like, "I have to agree"
K: yeah
S: Does that mean he has reservations? Like, ah, he really believes that, you know, people are more important, that the laws just say that and he has to follow em or? Wait.....
K: (?)
K: I don't know. I just didn't, I thought that was like the weakest one of the three.
G: Yeah, me too.... Well, that's enough of the spotted owl! (laugh)
S: Yeah
K: Yeah, //OK, which one do we want next?
L: //OK, which one do we want to do next?
K: Let's do the second worst one.
L: The second worst one? And that was..
G: That would be the banning of the books
K: the banning, well, I don't know.
L: OK, the second worst one. And that was "Knowledge calls for freedom", right?
G, K, S: Yeah.
G: the first paragraph is
K: Weird.
G: yeah.
L: awkward, yeah
K: It's like a story, but--
L: It's, he's trying to put a story in there, but it's just not very strong, you know. Where's the book, and, we don't have it cause it's censored
K: Well, if he doesn't do that he should have like one that has been censored from the library.
L: Yeah, use an example or something.

Tape goes on, but I'm stopping. Counter at 95.
Group 2

Group members: Class A
   Curt (G), Cary (V), Jeff (W), Amie (U)

Begin task one. Counter at 000

W: Perkins and Cashman and this is our criteria for our last paper of the year. ....And that, the criteria will be, I would say first of all we have to have a minimum of 10 sources...
V: agreed..
G: I agree with that.
U: yep...
W: well, firstly, or secondly you have to have your MLA documentation, you know, include in your bibliography and most of your quotes
U: yep
W: should be under that proper form of documentation. I think you have to have a clear thesis statement. You ah, let's, just state it at the beginning of the piece, say, make it clear and concise and to the point, and then at the end, again state your thesis and make sure that your audience knows exactly what you're talking about. I feel the organization needs to be well in this paper. You need to, your paragraphs must flow smoothly together with a good opening topic sentence of each paragraph and a good transition between each paragraph...And also multiple views I feel are important in a paper such as this..where we have to address both sides of the argument so that the audience could say, by review of the topic that that you're trying to discuss...and, that's about it.
V: //well I think
U://wait a minute
V: also there should be some good mechanics in the paper too, you gotta, you know make sure you get your periods and your documentation thingamibobs all straight so you, ah, are correct. Plus I think you oughta have the, the grammar side of it also oughta be, at least understandable and readable, and you know it.
U: ok, out and also we have to use ethos in your paper. By that I mean to be knowledgable about your topic, and you must also demonstrate fairness and talk about all the views, um , there may be more than just the one or two views ah, you need to elaborate on all the views. Also you need to build a bridge to the audience. These three things will establish ethos in your paper...
G: I think that's pretty good. One more thing, you have to be sure to get across your views on the topic and not just summarize everybody else's...
W: Well, I think that's it.
U: We need to rank these.
W: Ah, well yes
G: rank em
U: well, yeah,in this sentence she said in here
G: rank every sentence?
U: she said to rank them.
G: ah,
U: "most of all I'd like you to list the criteria that are imbedded in the assignment sheet. After you've listed the criteria then rank accordingly, 1 being most important."
W: well, probably I would think, I don't know about you guys but I think the most important would probably be a clear thesis.
U: yeah, I was going to say the same thing too.
W: cuz that's the main thing you want to across in your paper.
V: then you probably want your ethos side of it too, cuz you have to be knowledgable about your subject. Then I think you'll gonna, er G's there about the, that you get your own point across.

U: and then least important then, is even though it isn't important but the MLA format. But that's just

V: yeah

U: a technicality. If only you get the main point there, you've got really, the core of this paper.

V: it's got to be organized right though

W: yeah, because if it isn't organized right you aren't going to get your main point across anyway, so.

V: and it will be all screwed up and then nobody's going to understand it.

U: so thesis would be number one,

V: yeah

U: organization, I mean

V: clear thesis ties as number 2

U: ok, and thirdly?

V: um, getting your own point across

U: own point across. OK

V: you got it.

W: that's it.

V: all done now.

End task one. Counter at 048.

Begin task two. Counter at 049.

W: Alright, we're back. I'm W along with V, U and G, and we're here again to do the second part of our assignment. And we're gonna first of all rank the papers that we found and basically talk about what we thought about each paper and how they met, or didn't meet up to the criteria that was set by, by what we talked about earlier in the tape....and let's talk about our third paper.

U: the paper that we found that was the ah the worst so to speak, that did not meet the criteria was ah, well, it doesn't even have a title, so then we can start with that, but it has to deal with ah, the problem about ah, society

G: overpopulation

U: oh yeah, overpopulation, ok. Um, first of all, it didn't have a title. Second of all, a big problem that I found it didn't have a bibliography at all. The in text documentation was incorrect, um, there was a lot of run-on sentences and sentences that were just too long and hard to comprehend. Ah, paragraphs went from one point to another without any transitions...and ah, it just didn't make a lot of sense to me. I couldn't find a thesis statement in it because it, there was so much information I think, I think the facts were there, the information was there but, as far as organization or putting together to say something strongly, just, just didn't come out.

G: I think there was a lot of information but it didn't put in his own points of view on the topic...um, (?)...

U: ok.

G: so that's number 3.

U: that's the third paper.

W: I think prob—the second paper that we found was, the one on the spotted owl. Um, this paper had a lot of information it presented, and ah, I think presented it somewhat well, I think first of all the thesis statement was good and it established that in the beginning statement that, that the spotted owl needs to be protected, but then, I didn't think throughout the piece it didn't really go on
to really support that thesis very well. Um, it has a lot of great, great information in it too, um, the documentation is good in the paper...but I don't know, I just, I just feel that that the information is there but it wasn't put together very well. And ah, the paragraphs didn't flow as well as what I'd like to see that there wasn't a good, good transition between each paragraph. I liked how at the end it finally did, it stated the thesis again and how, how important it was that we do protect the spotted owl. And I think it just, the author did a good job of doing that...

V: oh, I be-I agree with W there but um, the gram-the mechanics on the whole thing kinda stunk. He, he had a lot of mistakes. Some of the sentences were all messed up and didn't make a lot of sense. Um, I don't know, is this right? I was told we weren't supposed have a comma there

U: no, no

V: so the, I think the in text documentation is wrong because it's got a comma, and you told me we weren't supposed to have one. So, anyway. Um, W's right, the paragraphs, they just didn't flow. Um, he talked about one thing and then just completely changed it and started talking about another thing. It was kind of choppy it didn't read, it didn't flow, it didn't, you know. And, the bibliography is all right, um,

U: yeah, and the spaces, it's hard to read

V: yeah, it needs a little bit more space. It needs to check up on where double spaces and periods. Nope, looks like he's got all his periods, but needs to make sure about the double spaces. Paper number two...

W: And, the number one paper we found was, "knowledge calls for freedom" by this author. First of all I thought did an excellent job, and ah, I like kinda the little story or the knowledge or the author set up at the beginning, talking about setting up the thesis statement. And then all of a sudden then going on and stating the thesis statement which was very clear and concise which I like very well. Um, and then the author goes on to really set up the thesis and maintain that thesis throughout the entire piece with a lot of good information, and great documentation. And ah, I liked how the author's cited specific books and talked about talked about how there isn't some clear cut information saying that that ah books have caused people to go out and do bad things, and talked about I don't know how basic this is but the idea of censorship is bad for society and ah, I just think this is a great paper throughout. And again I like how the author gets to the thesis at the end and talked about how what a bad idea censorship is that we should even have this in our country this is terrible. And I just liked this paper a lot...

U: I thought this was an excellent paper also. Um, in comparison to the other two first off, it's got a nice bold title that jumps right out at you. Ah, the second thing that jumped right out at me was the thesis statement. It's right there in the second paragraph, and it, it was just there. Um, the transitions were great, ah, the information is there. Everything is documented correctly. Ah, the conclusion is good, ah, everything I found was good. We didn't we didn't find any errors in this paper. Um, even the bibliography which, you can usually find some kind of an error, in there, you know, in underlining and quotes or periods or something, and ah, as far as we can see it's all done correctly. It's ah, a very good paper......

W: well...I guess that's it. You know, I hate to get all emotional at this, but sometimes (sniffles in background), I, it's been, I don't know how many weeks how many months that we've been in this class (sobbing in the background). It's been a good--hey, V, it's OK. It's ok buddy. Ah, we'd like to thank you for all that you've helped us to improve our writing and, ah, I think we've come out with some good arguments with our papers that we've written throughout the semester...and have a Merry Christmas.

U: Merry Christmas.

V: Merry Christmas.

G: Merry Christmas.
Group 3

Group members: Class B
   Kari (C), Lynn (A), Randy (B), John (Y), Ron (D)

Begin task one. Counter at 0

Y: Ok, now what do we say?
B: Hello! We're all here tonight to do our criteria
A: What group are we group number three?
Y: We are group number three.
B: Rubsam
D: Kaiser
Y: My name's Hindmann.
A: Edwardson
C: Anderson
D: And it's time for another fireside chat.
B: Alright.
Y: And close that door. (laughter)
D: close the door, open the door, close the door, open the door.
B: Alright
D: Turn the heat off
Y: //well that's a deep subject
C: //Well, one of them is that we need 10 sources
B: This is true
C: Yes. Make use of our 10 sources
A: Oh, are we talking about our requirements?
Y: I believe criteria is the right word.
C: What?
D: We have to make use of all 10 sources?
B: yeah
C: Yes.
B: we have to like, ha
D: revision
B: Ah, the writer has to put their point of view.
C: yes, definite writer's point of view
Y: writer's point of view.
B: yes
C: Agree? Do we agree?
A: ?
Y: Ah, grammar is a necessity.
A: I am?
Y: Hey! Grammar is a necessity.
D: These are actual class students.
Y: yes...
A: Hey you guys, this is really lame.
Y: Gotta —Documentation has got to be MLA.
B: I agree.
C: And it's gotta be correct.
Y: correct MLA.
B: It's gotta be good.
A: Did we mention punctuation?
D: We've gone through this.
Y: //We've gone through this so many times in class that we should know MLA.
C: //Yeah, grammar, punctuation, yeah
Y: Recite it backwards
D: We should know our way around the library and be able to find our sources.
Y: Of course I didn't go to the library for my paper but--
B: We won't tell.
C: Um, organization //that is needed
Y: //That's a must. That's a key
B: //Definite
D: //Yeah, organized, yeah. And it should be organized in a way that it would follow your paper.
Y: Yes, I agree with D.
A: That was very redundant D, (laugh)
Y: I used to be redundant, but now I'm not redundant. (laugh)
B: //Anyway
C: //And you need a thesis.
Y: Huh?
C: A main point or a thesis.
Y: The thesis, yes you must have a thesis.
D, B: Yes.
B: So the writer just states his point of view right out there, and a thesis.
Y: Yeah, another criteria.
D: Bibliography.
Y: Oh, must have a bibliography
B: //Bibliography.
Y: //Gotta have a bibliography (laughter)
D: Bibliography should not contain any of your own opinion //It should only be summaries of your sources.
Y: //You gotta have syrup. The syrup's gotta be warm. You definitely gotta have syrup.
C: We don't add that to this paper.
B: No, no, no, D
D: No, no
C: It's a bibliography page.
Y: No annotated bibliography. Slap his hands. (laughter)
B: Bad, bad, D.
Y: Bad, D, Bad. (laughter)
A: Do we have to include the rough draft?
C: Yes, rough draft included
Y: Rough draft must be included.
B: Ok
C: And both views.
Y: Oh yes, she must explain both //Points of views.
B: //Sides. Ok
Y: Both points of view. Yeah anyway.
B: View, both sides, sources
D: Siding, both sides of the view.
B: OK
Y: yeah, you have to have sources both for and against.
D: yeah, you should.
C: um hmm
Y: Yes, you should have. If you don't, there's something wrong with you. Are these steel toe?
B: No. Ow!
(Y kicks B's foot) laughter.
C: Ok, so let's do a final list of our criteria. 10 sources?
Y: 10 sources.
D: Check.
Y: Gotcha.
C: Writer's point of view?
D and Y: Check.
C: Grammar?
D and Y: Check.
A: Do you think we need to get out a sheet of paper? (laughter)
C: Organization?
Y and B: Check.
C: Thesis.
Y: Check.
C: Both views.
Y: Check, check.
C: and documentation using MLA.
Y: that's correct. Not the other one.
C: With an ending bibliography page.
Y: Check. No, no annotated bibliography (playfully hitting D). (laughter)
B: We gotta get going here. Alright.
C: //And session on criteria setting.
Y: //Is this supposed to be 10 minutes long?
B: This concludes....
Y: This concludes. Now let's rewind and let's hear what we gotta say.

End task one. Counter at 38.

Begin task two. Counter at 40

C: This is group number
A: 3
C: 3 with:
A: Edwardson
B: Rubsam
D: Kaiser
Y: limbo
C: and Anderson.... Um, (laughter)
A: Whoever Jimbo is we don't know. He just kind of wandered in.
Y: That's me.
C: We are doing the evaluations of papers. Three different papers
Y: We lettered them A, B, C.
C: Yes. And we're rating them with one is high, two is next, and three is low. We're beginning with paper number A about wolves.
D: Paper number A.
Y: Or the lack of.
C: Or the lack of wolves
B: In Yellowstone national Park.
Y: um hmm.
C: OK.
Y: So what did you think about the
D: There's a show on (?)
Y: D, what did you think about the lack of wolves?... (laughter)
Y: D.
D: I think there's a definite problem with the lack of wolves. I think (laughter)
B: No, uh, about the paper
Y: about the paper, D! You don't write the paper, you read the paper! Gal!
D: I thought the paper presented it --
B: laughter!....
D: I thought that the paper presented its arguments well. It made a lot of good points as to how well it, contribute--
A: Like what?
D: like what?
C: he's getting to it.
B: He's working on it.
D: Like um, they contribute to keeping down overpopulation in the park, as well as destruction of grazing lands from overpopulation and disease can be spread through other animals as well--
Y: So are you looking at it from the aspect of good land management maybe?
D: Yes, it's good land management.
B: Yeah, Cuz, yeah, and they also keep the population in good health.
Y: right. And they prevent starvation of ah, herbivores.
D: yes. They weed out the ah..
Y: the sick...
D: the sick the weak and the slow.
Y: It's ah survival of the fittest.
B: I would say--
D: the weak shall become weak.
Y: How did the paper prove that?
A: The paper was terrible.
B: No! Ok, support your claim.
A: // (disruption) no
D: well I found a lot of grammatical and spelling errors
B: that don't matter though.
C: that's part of our criteria
D: there were other things though(?)
Y: But still--it's a rough draft.
D: And you didn't let me get to my point yet.
A: And you didn't even let me finish. You asked me what I thought was wrong with it.
D: But I'm not done yet.
Y: OK, enough name calling stay on task.
A: laugh
C: OK, what do you think is wrong with it?
A: I think that it runs on, wait, gimme one.
D: It does have a, it is a little redundant and tend to repeat itself.
A: I think it runs on. Very redundant. It doesn’t ever tell the other side of the story.
D: Yes.
B: Oh, I disagree.
D: Yes, it does tell the other side of the story.
Y: I’m gonna have to disagree.
D: When it says that these farmers have ah, that ah, they don’t want wolves to be reintroduced into the park
A: OK, very quickly.
D: because they can possibly kill their livestock.
A: But it seems like, and somebody already said this before, that the paper is just basically a bunch of facts thrown together. And it just goes on and on and on.
D: I think they are supported.
B: I think there’s pretty good support because
Y: uproar(?)
D: I think it’s your opinion on this paper that causes you to think that.
A: laugh
Y: let me ask you a question
A: I think wolves should be reintroduced too, but
Y: Let me ask you a question.
A: What.
Y: Were you happy as a child? laughter.
Y: No, I’m serious. Did you have a dog as a kid?
A: I still have a dog.
Y: Do you really? Do you like wolves.
A: Yeah, they’re fine.
Y: Then what do you find wrong with this paper? Darnit! (laughter)
A: I don’t I don’t disagree with reintroducing wolves, I think the paper is really poor.
D: It is kind of a little offshootly organized. There is a lot of redundancy.
A: uhm hmm. It just goes on and on.
C: The paragraphs are really really long.
A: And I couldn’t find a thesis statement...
D: Wolves should be reintroduced to Yellowstone national park.
A: Find that.
Y: Well maybe it’s an underlying thesis statement.
D: I don’t think some of the facts are very well supported, either.
Y: I think it’s a very well, not a well written paper but it has a lot of good points to it.
B: yes.
D: yes.
Y: OK,
B: This is just my opinion but
Y: OK, let’s listen to B (person not paper).
B: Doesn’t everybody get out of this that wolves should be reinstated into Yellowstone. So it doesn’t have to be flat out in the paper.
A: I don’t think- Y: Does it. listen.
Y: Does it persuade you?
B: yes. For me.
C: same for me.
A: Well I believed that before. But no, it wouldn't have persuaded me if I didn't believe that.
Y: //But you can't say that unless you knew something about it.
C: //It persuaded me and I didn't know anything about it.
D: //I don't have anything against it....
A: //What's the point
Y: //D, you're mumbling. (laughter)...
B: No, but that's Ok.
A: //Well I have a good reason.
Y: //No, that was like the tree in Karate Kid 3.
B: Well this is true it's just that we're all against you right now.
A: Well then, vote what it is, 1, 2, or 3.
Y: // What was 1? is 1 high?
B: I think we should go through the others first.
D: I thought that..B (paper) was high, the tillage one...although it had a lot of difficulties, //I thought it was the best structured paper.
Y: //I give it a 2
1/2. No, no, let me think about this.
A: really
Y: I give it a 1.5
D: although it had a lot of problems
B: I think that one sucked.
D: //I think it had a lot of problems, OK.
Y: //Is 1 good?
C: 1 is high, yeah.
B: very high.
Y: I give it a 2. Give it a 2. compared to the others.
C: What do you guys think. No, I don't give it a 1.
A: I don't either. 2.
B: Yeah, but a 1 out of 3 out of these three papers?
A: I don't think--do we have to give each one a different one?
C: We don't. No, no
Y: Look, just because you're a forestry major and you like wolves doesn't mean you have to give it a 1.
B: I didn't mean anything by it (laughter)
D: I didn't say it.
C: Wait a minute.
Y: Don't shut it off.
C: No, I'm gonna pause it for a minute.
pause.
C: so, what do we think on this paper A.
Y: What do we, what do we give it?..
D: um
C: I say 2.
Y: I say 2.. Come on, B, you're the stick in the mud here.
B: I liked it.
Y: B says two.
A: two.
Y: say it, B.
B: two.
Y: so we all give it a two. //You like that answer? I thought you would.
D: //I don't think it's a two.
C: Do you not think it's a two?
B: I don't know.
D: Can I see the paper?
C: You think it's a one?
Y: If you think it's better you need to support it.
B: Well I think it's better than the other one
C: Well yeah, but with all these criteria it doesn't meet all these very criteria to its fullest.
Y: Do we have to order these as in one is the best paper?
B: yeah
C: no
D: I think the author got a little=
Y: No, it's not 1 is the best paper, 2 is the next paper, and 3 is the bad paper.
D: That's good.
C: No. Evaluate them as to //how well they meet the criteria. 1 is highest and 3 is lowest.
B: //well sorree.
Y: Geez, B.
A: don't you ever read your assignments?
D: No.
Y: I was thinkin the same thing you were for a while.
D: Um, I thinking that this person just wanted to added things to make this paper a little lengthy.
Y: lengthy.
D: Therefore got a little redundant..
C: You still talking about A (paper)? With the wolves?
D: yeah, paper A
C: OK
D: if they could've cut some things out it would've served its purpose very well.
C: shortened the paragraphs.//make more transitions
Y: //but doesn't the redundancy give more examples? It could be reworded so it wasn't redundant?
D: It could be reworded, but a lot of places in the paper seems to be nearly repeating itself word for word.
Y: OK,... I agree with ya.....
C: So do we agree on ranking it as a 2.
Y: Everybody think it's a 2.
B: sure
Y: sure.
C: // Well you think we're supposed to rank em 1,2,3
B: //No, no, I'm just reading through here cause I think I'm just messed up and I just want to clarify myself some....(?)
C: Well we'll go through and rank them and then we could rank--
B: I was just kiddin.
A: //let's go on
C: // the ones we think 1,2,3. (small uproar) so we have it all
Y: Paper B. I'll admit I was wrong.
Y: Paper B was about tillage?
D: Paper B was about tillage.
Y: tillage.
B: tillage.
D: tillage. I found the argument kind of difficult to follow.
B: follow. Yes, I agree.
C: very difficult. points being made were real short.
B: Obviously. I don't
Y: I thought it was kind of jerky. It didn't keep your attention on one thing. It pulled you around.
D: A (person), as our example. If you didn't understand tillage it didn't give you any clue as to what was going on.
Y: right. If you were a reader that was clueless, you'd still be clueless.
A: Sure. Thanks.
D: Why? (laugh)
A: Appreciate it.
D: I don't know much about tillage.
A: Farm boy.
D: I'm not a farm boy either.
Y: //I'm a little partial to farmers.
B: //Now now, now, let's just keep personal opinions out of it
A: laugh
B: We all know farmers are number one, so.
C: Anyway, um.
A: that's right. Everyone wants to be a farmer when they grow up.
C: //Does this affect--does this present--does that
Y: //I wouldn't mind being a farmer?
B: But, Let's stay on task here if we can.
Y: What do you think about farmers?
C: Did this present both views?..
B: um I didn't think really well.
Y: I didn't think it did.
A: not really.
C: it wasn't very noticable.
B: No.
Y: if it did, it just kind of touched on it and then...
C: And as a thesis, I did not see a
D: // Yeah, I thought the thesis
Y: //I couldn't find a thesis
C: clear thesis.
B: me either. It just supplied a lot of data I think.
C: yeah
Y: yeah
B: it said that //tillage was (?)
Y: //it was like reading the back of an encyclopedia, it didn't give any
B: right
D: yeah, and then it, but it kind of hard to tell, but not enough information on soil tillage (? mike problems)
B: true
D: kind of puts it in the end, conclusion, kind of makes the thesis clear.....
B: hmm.
Y: OK, boys, we've got 17 more minutes
D: We've got a few more minutes
Y: till what?....
C: um
A: The grammar was better in this one, though.
C: //yeah
D: //yes, it was
A: than the other one
C: um hmm.
D: it was much shorter
Y: yeah, but I don't think grammar. On a rating list I don't think grammar would rate it that high.
C: //But we're supposed to look at all criteria
A: //Yeah, well we're supposed to look at all aspects.
Y: I thought I'd get them going for a little while (laugh)
B: Just a little bit, I know, as soon as I...
C: I mean we must look at all aspects of the criteria. All 10 sources, I mean, 10 sources were used.
Y: correct. //But were they just-
C: //um, and organization
A: //wait how do we know all 10 sources were used in the bibliography?
Y: //I thought the organization in this was really cool
C: I counted them.
B: She counted them.
A: oh.
D: ooooh.
C: The bibliography is gonna tell you that they are all used, so they might not use them in..
A: But it should be included in the bibliography, which it didn't have.
C: Well, not, the rough drafts didn't have to.
A: really
C: um hmm.
B: But, as a criteria, it's supposed to have a bibliography.
Y: Yeah, it's supposed to have a bibliography//oh
B: Oh, this one's out the door (laugh)
Y: 3,3,3,3,3! (laugh)..
B: Sorry, C (person).
C: um, I don't care. Didn't take long.
Y: You're so prim and proper, geez
C: laugh
D: ok. "I don't care."
Y: what are you laughin about?
B: So we're saying this one's worse than the other one
Y: yeah
C: um hmm. Were you saying that you thought we had to rank them first second and third?
B: Yeah, I don't know why, I thought we had to rank them first second and third.
Y: I did too
D: Yeah.
C: The more you say that I think that's right.
A: Yeah, then the capital punishment gets a 1.
C: Yeah. Well let's just rank each one how we think, and at the end we'll --
Y: at the end we'll go back.
B: at the end we'll go through them again.
Y: sounds like a winner.
B: yeah.
C: well, I give this a 3.
B: I would give it a 2.
Y: 8
D: I'll be a generous judge and give it a 2.7
B: I think it's low.
Y: I don't care to put a number on it, but I think it's low.
C: OK. It did not present both sides clearly, //writer's point of view was not stated very well
Y: //it did not meet our criteria
B: wasn't as clear as paper number A
C: OK
Y: it was not an adequate paper...
B: Alright now on to
Y: (?)
C: On to paper C, which was about capital punishment.
Y: C, capital punishment.
D: capital punishment.
Y: this is such a touchy subject that I'm not sure we should, you know
D: yeah, it's a kinda controversial subject.
Y: yeah, very controversial.
B: Let's dig in. Go
D: (?)
Y: I, I, personally, I'm for it. I mean, you know, killing people is not cool.
C: //Ok, what about the paper?
Y: //ranks right up there
D: laughter.
B: I thought the paper was good until the end.
D: (?)
Y: Oh, the paper.
C: until the end about what?
A: Yeah, I thought the ending was pretty poor. But--
B: The ending really was weak, very weak.
C: Why?
Y: they didn't support themselves.
B: you can see right through the ending, I mean there's a lot of, you can knock the ending down.
Y: //laugh. Tell me it ain't so
D: //Well there's lots of points in the paper that you can knock down, though, but ah.
B: yeah, but= D: Punishment, capital punishment is against American laws and like, //all these (?)
C: //well the ending didn't really conclude anything.
A: It just sort of (?)
Y: It was a cliffhanger
B: A cliffhanger, yeah.
A: although I do like the beginning of it. //I like the way he, he or she set it up
Y: //I like the way the paper was presented
D: The beginning was well set up.
A: It was interesting.
B: I thought it was kind of redundant like the other one you know we were talking about I mean they state like three or four times that this is murder, and the law is murder, so murdering is the law and we're murdering all this stuff, you know like the law is going against itself. I don't know.
C: Well, I thought--
D: I didn't find much in the opposing points of view, either.
C: No, and I, and the opposing point that he had put, or he or she had put, all seemed like a
generalization. There is no documentation around it and it, to me was all generalized, I mean, the
person generalized what the opposing view was.
Y: Well, if you're talking about documentation, I noticed in the first one that the whole first page
doesn't have a single documentation on it. And some of the stuff that they said had to be
documented, because it's stuff like facts.
D: ah,
Y: it had to come out of something.
D: they're kind of common knowledge facts.
B: yeah, I was gonna say. If you've got a general idea, you don't have to.
D: yeah.
Y: "The wolves started to prey on the only thing that could supplement their diet, the way the
bison deer and moose could"
D: But we're not talking about the wolves.
Y: No, I know but I'm just saying that now, that we moved on to documentation I think the first one
was kind of weak. It was kind of weak, I thought.
D: in its documentation?
C: it was really weak in the first one I thought. also. //Don't use any until the third page.
D: //It's a very, a hard issue.
B: well yeah, it's hard not to.
C: You clearly saw the writer's point of view but
Y: did they support it, is the thing.
C: they, didn't present the opposite.
B: they brought up a lot of very good facts for their point of view but the opposing was
C: terrible
B: minimal.
Y: well it isn't that--that strengthens your argument,
B: true
Y: you know, to a point.
C: yeah, but
Y: but if you're so overboard that all you present is your side and not the other side
D: yeah, I felt that they didn't present the other side.
Y: did, or didn't.
D: Didn't. It was.
Y: I felt it was extremely informational, but other than that it didn't present a clear argument.
C: how about you?
B: kind of like our tillage one
D: it had its, it had its points, few good points scattered in there.
Y: I could have written a better paper. (laugh)
B: well of course, I mean we know you're wonderful and all (laugh)
D: we know you're a god. (laugh)
C: What do you think about it?
Y: //keep it coming, guys, keep it coming (laughter)
A: //I thought it was interesting and that's why because of the controversy cause I think a
controversy like this is interesting. But I don't think it, I mean I agree with the rest that it didn't
do a good job of presenting the issue at all. It was very//it was poor
Y: //it's such a touchy issue
D: (?)
Y: You gotta take that into account.
A: There are parts in it that are good.
C: umhmm.
A: but, it's sort of weak. Weakens, as it goes on.
C: Yeah, as it goes along it gets weaker, definitely
Y: what could they have done then, to turn the paper around?
C: um
A: there were a lot of phrases that he or she uses that are not what you would use in a formal paper, they're sort of casual? I think that the person needs to=
Y: //Now define casual
D: //Nah, it depends upon your audience is, you know, you're audience.
A: well--
C: but capital punishment, though
A: except for capital punishment you're not writing for preschoolers. //You're writing for--
Y: //define casual
D: you have to start somewhere.
A: I just thought it was sort of casually written, it was just, it was written sort of, it just seemed like a little off hand.
Y: I thought that that aspect of it was kind of //refreshing because it brought out a different point of view that I hadn't seen before.
D: //it brings it more (?)
B: It kind of brought it down to a personal level, instead of
D: more one on one
C: compared to that like, soil tillage
D: yeah
C: I mean, I didn't understand some of the stuff in there
D: yeah.
(?)
C: what'd you'd say?
Y: It's kind of funny how we all look at it in a little different way. Some of us like the fact that it isn't such
C: umhmm
Y: you know, It's easier to understand I think It's easier for the normal person to read it and get more out of it than they would if it was written//less casually
A: //I guess I'm just a more formal person.
D: more down to earth
C: you're just smarter. Smarter than the four of us.
D: more Intellectual...
A: thank you.
B: you know I just think it's more common, I mean,
Y: I think its, yeah.
B: it makes you think about common Joe sitting there in jail instead of
Y: yeah
D: yeah
Y: //I think the more you relate to
D: //appeals to a wider audience
Y: the more you relate to an audience the more you write a paper focused with your audience in mind.
C: It was a lot easier to read.
Y: yeah
B: Ok, so what we're saying is..
Y: over, and over and over again..
C: Are we feeling alright?
Y: uhhuh.
A: It's also shorter, which was nice
Y: it was concise.
D: it was, yeah
A: the other ones seemed to just go on.
D: //yeah the wolf one seemed to drag on just a bit.
Y: // yeah, I think they brought out their point, they made their point, they backed it up and then they ended it.. Their ending was weak, but as a whole I think their paper was fairly decent.
A: yeah
B: just needed a little more work
Y: needed a little more work at the end....
C: ok, so
Y: what do we give this one?
A: one
Y: one?
D: two
B: two
Y: I give it a, 1.8
A: I say two
C: I'm set on two. So out of the three, if that's the way we're supposed to do it
B: Sure
Y: how would we rank these?
C: How would we rank em. Well, three I think would be the soilage one
Y: yeah the tillage one. That's way down.
D: yeah
B: soilage
A: soilage
C: laugh
B: soilage on the (?)
Y: that soilage, doggonit
laugh
C: um, why? Do we have, I mean, brief
Y: it was Wayne and Garth
D: yeah, it was very unaudience orientated, I thought
B: laugh, woah unaudience orientated (laughter)
C: just presented the facts with no real views// and too many different views
Y: //how about audience unorientated?
C: OK, so between 1, I mean A=
Y: Ok, so we got the soilage tillage one at the end
C: that's that's three.
B: three.
C: Now between//two and one
B: //two and one....
C: I'd go for the wolves as one
Y: I do too.
B: I'll go too.
D: Um, I'll have to jump on the bandwagon and say, I'll agree
Y: wolves
B: //wolves for one
A: // why?
D: cause I like them.
B: I think overall //it stated both sides, I mean true, it went on a little longer
A: //I like the wolves
C: um hmm
B: but, it's a rough draft, and it got a lot of stuff out.
Y: and it presented //both sides which, the other one didn't
C: //better than the capital punishment
Y: that's my main reason for not putting it second (?)
D: I thought it covered all the points whereas the capital punishment didn't like cover all the criteria.
Y: I agree.
B: yeah.
A: ok
C: is that ok?
A: sounds fine with me.
Y: now you gotta make a, come on, argue a little bit. (laughter)
B: no, no, no!
D: yeah, shut up! (laughter)
C: Ok, so 1 we have as the wolf paper
Y: it was A
C: A. 2..
Y: capital// punishment C
C: //capital punishment C..
B: and 3, soilage tillage! (laughter)
All: B
Y: the order: A,C,B. ACB
C: does this now end? this ends....
A: now we have to rank our criteria
Y: Stop. In the name of love.
A: stop and rank them, and go back.

End task two. Counter at 278.

C: we //forgot to rank our criteria so we are now adding that to this tape
Y: //the people of the United States.
B: Please don't hold it against us.
D: Oh, she's gonna get to the end, don't you think she'll stop it, cause she'll think it's over?
C: well we'll tell her.
A: She won't be that quick.
C: criteria...
guys: OH.....
A: I didn't mean it like that..
Y: F for you
B: F F F F
Still more, but I'm stopping. Counter at 281.
Group 4

Group members: Class B
Tasha (T), Jerry (I), Tony (Z)

Begin task one. Counter at 0.

I: This is Gardner.
T: Laugesen.
Z: Howell.
I: And we're here to do our criteria for our next paper. And we're recording it for ya. (laugh) Just go, just go.
T: OK.
I: What do you think the criteria should be, the main ones?
T: Organization, I think, is a good one. (laughter)
I: God, T, that was funny! OK
T: No, OK, go
I: OK, um, ah, the basics, just like grammar and correct spelling, mechanics.
Z: and make sure we use MLA properly
I: (whispering) someone write this down
T: and multiple views of people, //I mean
Z: //Yeah you have to present both sides.
T: yeah
I: equally
Z: yes.
T: //and you have to have a
I: //good thesis statement
T: bibliography, doesn't it?
I: isn't the bibliography the works cited?
Z: it's the same thing. It's just called works cited under the MLA system.....
I: cool.
T: ah...
Z: have at least 10 sources in the bibliography.
T: and you have to give your point of view in the paper....
I: you gotta use, wait. (laughter)
Z: I already said that, didn't I?
I: I know you said use 10 sources but I meant like 10 or 15 pages, but that's not the list, that's yeah
Z: yeah, that's just general guidelines.
T: so what's most important? Should I write these?
Z: Yeah, we need to rank them from best to worst.
T: is 1 the best?
Z: yes, 1's the best.
I: And probably like the content, the things that have to do with content like thesis and views, and stuff should be first.
Z: and clearly stated.
T: right.
I: yeah, those should be first and then like the grammar and mechanics should be last.
T: yeah
I: cause those are important but still
Z: yeah
T: yeah, well, you should know them, I mean
I: yeah, good point.
T: thank you
I: ok, so what do you guys think should go first?
Z: I say organization
T: me too...
I: me three. OK, then, thesis?
T: yeah, thesis
I: mark down what we're doin' first so,
T: OK, do you have a pen? I do. OK, organization 1,
I: thesis 2.
T: thesis 2.
T: what about multiple views?
Z: yeah, put, multiple views for 3.
T: 3.
I: And then after your views you have to have, know what view yourself takes would be 4,
T: Ok
I: your own view point.
T: Ok.
Z: then documentation...
I: well you have to have the sources first, so probably would be the sources first and then
documentation, for criteria, wouldn't it?
Z: yeah.
I: important cause you can't document something you don't have.
T: that's true.
Z: true.
I: Point well taken.
T: true. OK, 10 sources is 5, //documentation 6
I: bibliography 7.
T: 7.
Z: 7.
T: grammar
I: 8 and
T: 8
I: mechanics 9
T: 9.
I: conclusion 10 (laughter).

End task one. Counter at 038.

Begin task two. Counter at 040.

I: Oh, um...we're gonna do the, we're on the second part of the assignment now
Z: part two
I: thank you ,Z.
(Laughter)
Z: no problem
I: We have to, um, We have to, I liked it better the first time. We have three papers assigned to us, and we ranked, we put each one letter A, B, and C, and we have to compare them to the criteria that we set out of what we thought a good paper should be like, and, now after that we have to go about and then rank them to which one we thought was overall better. And the first one A is on capital punishment.

Z: B is on the advantages and disadvantages of requiring minimum tillage for farmers.

I: And C is on the environment and wolves...

T: alright. Let's start with A.

Z: start with A.

I: And we're going to go right down our list of our

criteria as to what was important to what was least important. But so,

that's right.

I: Right. So we're going to start with organization.

T: And it wasn't organized.

Z: What organization.

T: What organ--no. um, the viewpoints were scattered throughout the paper, like there was no, I don't know, it was, kind of confusing because it kept going back and forth to different points of view, I don't know

Z: sort of unclear.

T: very unclear.

I: I agree.

T: laugh

Z: thank you.

I: Ok, part 2, thesis or number 2, thesis.

T: what thesis? Was there, no, there was a thesis

Z: no thesis

I: it was kind of hard to pick out a clear thesis.

T: where was the thesis

Z: I found a thesis, I don't know where, but I found one.

I: Gee, that could be lack of organization.

Z: I think I did, or I may have just picked it up from reading the whole paper

T: right, maybe you

Z: um, maybe it wasn't clearly stated, I can't remember.

T: because it started off with that //story

Z: //story about John Doe

T: twitches.. (laugh)

Z: how does she know he twitches? That's all I'd like to know. How do they know he twitches?

T: (?) There really isn't a clear stated thesis.

I: at least on the introduction there isn't.

T: No, cuz it just goes from that story right into different view points and different positions on that, doesn't it?

Z: yeah.

I: it's bad organization.

T: bad

Z: bad

T: laugh

I: Ok, so we all agree on the thesis, or lack of. Number 3, multiple views.

T: yeah, there was

Z: multiple views. They had em.
T: everywhere. No, they did have good, I don't know, different sides, but just the way they presented them
Z: they, well, yeah.
I: See now I don't know
T: it's just like
Z: ok, yeah
T: bad.
I: bad. (laughter) wait. First I think like when they did that, they seemed to state more for the negative side than they did for the positive side. yeah
Z: It wasn't equal.
T: I have a question real quick. What side is this person for. //They're against it, right?
Z: //they're against capital punishment
T: Ok, yeah.
I: um
Z: ok what's next
I: number 4. Writer's point of view.
Z: it was there.
T: was it? I didn't—I mean I'm sure it was, but
I: we can just tell in how he stated it
T: I was just confused because one minute he was saying well it's good because of this and then they're saying well no it's bad because of this.
Z: Ok, well I'm figuring that there are laws against it
I: yeah, me too.
T: yeah
I: like on the third page, he goes like, towards the bottom, he says like "And this is one reason why it might be good", but then without even continuing on the same point he automatically goes to why it is bad. And doesn't tell you why it's good
Z: yeah
T: yeah, um hmm. Right there. cool.
I: yeah, see? Cuz I just got done reading it. OK, 10 sources
Z: non-applicable.
I: why.
Z: cause
I: you didn't have to have 10 sources?
Z: how can you tell?
I: does he have a bibliography?
Z: no there's no bibliography
T: no there's no bibliography
I: well, we'll get to that later
T: we'll look at that
I: ok, number 6 documentation MLA
Z: it was wrong,
T: yeah
Z: it wasn't used right.
T: yeah
Z: it wasn't used properly.
T: the periods weren't, they were after the sentence, and things
Z: yeah, and the documentation was after that. So...next.
I: Um, you're in a hurry, ain't ya (laughter). number 7 bibliography.
T: there isn't one.
Z: that doesn't apply either.
I: ok, we agreed on that. Number 8, grammar
T: really bad
Z: bad, extremely.
I: give an example, T.
T: give an example, um, that big long sentence
Z: the run on.
T: should I read it?
I: no don't read it (laugh)
T: I'll be going for a while
I: it's too long. OK I think she gets the idea
Z: they switch verb tenses in the middle of paragraphs
T: right, yeah. They had a lot of commas, and quotes and lots of parenthenses
Z: unclear sentences
T: yeah
I: Ok, ah...and last but not least, mechanics.
T: they couldn't spell
Z: they couldn't spell
T: they couldn't spell at all.
I: maybe this is a rough draft. I think it's a rough draft.
T: yeah, but still.
I: if they really took their time this would have been a lot better paper.
Z: exactly
T: right. if this was a, well
Z: this was a rough draft
I: in a couple more years, they could really go to town (laughter) (?).
Z: ok
I: Ok
Z: paper B.
T: paper B.
I: yeah we shot down paper A, time to go to paper B. Paper b is on the
T: thumbs down.
Z: minimum tillage
T: oh
I: the tillage
Z: farming
I: very interesting. Let's start again. Number 1,
Z: why don't you give us your real view on that, I?
I: why thank you.
T: yeah, (laugh) what did you think?
I: (laugh) T's over here, shittin a brick (laughter).... OK, number 1 organization
Z: organization..
T: it was kind of organized.
Z: not too bad.
T: yeah, it wasn't too bad....
I: Ok, I agree. Um, thesis.
Z: thesis. yeah, I got the thesis at the very end of the paper. They waited until the end//to state the thesis
T: //where at?

Where was it?
Z: ah, at the end pretty much
I: in the conclusion
Z: it ah, let's see. More or less the writer says that more research is needed.
T: yeah, if more research is done, that would help us.
I: cool, I agree.
Z: Ok
T: yeah, OK the thesis is at the end.
I: number 3, multiple views.
T: there were several yeah.
Z: I think there were, actually it listed the advantages and disadvantages.
T: yeah
I: are they pretty equal?
Z: yeah
T: yeah they were.
Z: cause I couldn't tell what side they were taking until the very end.
I: it seems kind of boring to me, personally
T: I know (laugh)
Z: I didn't really understand it
I: I'm not a farmer (?) (laughter) OK, um, the writer's point of view is number 4. What did, I couldn't really pick it out, it just seemed plain
Z: till the end
T: not till the end
I: end of the conclusion.
Z: which was like the thesis
I: which is good, he seemed to state both sides equally on it, and state his own view at the end.
Z: yeah.
T: yeah.
I: didn't lead you on.
T: it was a lot of facts and quotes and...stuff
I: number 5 and stuff number 5. 10 sources.
Z: skip it.
I: skip it? Ok, skip it.
T: no bibliography
I: Z said that. OK, number 6. documentation MLA.
Z: it was alright. I didn't find any problems with it.
T: no.
I: how bout T.
T: it looked good to me too.
I: yeah, I triple that. Um. Bibliography number 7
T: doesn't apply.
Z: skip it.
T: didn't have one
I: didn't have one
T: a big no
I: trying to sneak by us, but no. Number 8
T: nothing gets by us (laugh).
I: nope. We're as good as those teachers. teacher's aide. No, just kidding. number 8 grammar
Z: grammar.
T: grammar was good.
Z: was it good? it was good.
T: let me look.
Z: yeah it was good.
T: it was better than the other one.
I: it had that kind of great boring scientific paper kind of boring thing to it. Besides that//that's about all it had.
Z: //exactly.
I: hit that one on the nail. OK
Z: except for misusage of the word effect.
I: yeah
T: yeah
Z: in a couple spots, it should have been affect.
I: and number 9, mechanics.
Z: a couple spelling errors
T: yeah, just spelling //little bit not too many
Z: //not as bad as the first paper
I: No, ah, don't rank the papers
Z: Ok
I: overall
T: just a few spelling errors
I: it's kind of thumbs and a half
Z: no it's kind of (?)
I: Ok, third paper. That one's still in flight. It's kind of
Z: C. yeah. //On the environment and wolves
T: //OK, the environment and the wolves thing
Z: the wolf not wolves
T: that's the one
Z: let's begin.
I: yep. the last one, or A or C,
Z: C
I: C, sorry
T: C
I: is about
T: C
I: Is about C?
T: nope (laugh)
I: is about wolves and the environment and Yellowstone. Something like that. And ah
Z: ok.
I: organization number 1..
Z: um not bad.
T: it wasn't bad. Organization was pretty good.
Z: except for a couple parts.
I: I agree. um number 2 thesis statement.
Z: thesis, ah,
T: yeah
Z: yeah
T: there was a good thesis somewhere.
Z: we could figure that out.
T: yeah
I: thesis was somewhere? How bout you?
Z: yeah, it was easy to figure out.
T: yeah it was pretty clear.
I: yeah, ok, but was it, did they state it? right off, or
T: um
Z: yeah
T: yeah they did.
Z: it's like the last sentence of the introduction.
T: um hrm
I: yeah, I knew that, I was just checking. OK, ah, 3 multiple views. don't laugh it's not funny.
T: yeah, there was.
Z: yeah, they presented both sides of the issue
I: he wasn't biased any side, was he?
Z: no, I didn't find it.
I: what? He,
Z: oh, I'm sorry.
I: it, the writer.
Z: he or she.
I: He didn't seem to portray, he didn't put his point of view into too early though.
T: or she
I: I said, the writer.
T: but last time you just said he
I: I know I said he, but I meant it.
T: ok
Z: can we, ah, be productive here?
T: laugh
I: yes Z. (laugh)... OK, number 4 writer's point of view...
Z: Yeah, we figured that out.
T: yeah, they could ah put a little more, maybe.
Z: yeah
T: they were kind of brief but we knew what they were
Z: after
T: what point of view they were, yeah......
I: ok, they put a little more than the 12 pages they had. Ok, um, 10 sources.
Z: 10 sources, well, ah, maybe.
T: there's a bibliography, so
I: bibliography! bonus.
Z: 10 sources, yes.
T: 10 sources.
I: thumbs up. OK, bibliography?
Z: yes, check.
T: yes, yes, check.
I: you're supposed to say check.
T: oh I'm sorry, check.
I: Ok.
T: let's try it again. Ready?
I: alright. Check.
Z: check.
T: check.
I: mate, ha ha. OK, grammar
Z: grammar, um
T: they,
Z: ah, no, not good
T: yeah,
Z: I thought it was the worst
T: page three was really bad.
Z: page three. Yeah, page three was bad
T: yeah. It had a lot of errors.
I: it didn't seem to have all of its, like, sentences in the right place, and it didn't didn't.
Z: they were confusing
I: well, it didn't, it wasn't clear
Z: once again, not proper use of the word effect
T: yeah
I: and affect
Z: affect
I: (?) is that all we need for grammar, or, were there any other problems?
Z: a couple of confusing sentences, but that was about it.
T: what about the part ...that one part that you said
Z: oh,
T: what part does that go under?
I: what about the-
Z: ah, that would be organization, probably
T: that was really bad.
Z: what about the,
I: that wasn't very good
Z: yeah, that time they were scoled (?) for shining a flashlight at the wolf?
T: yeah, that was really bad paragraph.
I: that was about the whole paragraph there.
T: that was kind of (whisper(?)).
I: um, yeah, I thought when I was reading it that ah
T: sure you did. (laugh)
I: shut up. I thought when I was reading the first couple things that it didn't seem to fit. You don't really need to know about the settlers coming to America and how that affected the wolves. That wasn't actually important. At least I didn't think so. Well that has nothing to do with grammar, does it. OK, number 9.
T: mechanics.
I: mechanics Thank you.
T: you're welcome
I: mechanics
Z: spelling mistakes
T: spelling
I: sucks
T: was bad
Z: bad
T: very bad
I: bad. OK, this joke's getting a little lame... We have lame sheep herder.
Z: Baaaad.
I: this is getting baaaad. OK.
T: they don't use "theirs" either. You know, "they are" "there", and their. They use them all wrong.
Z: they use them wrong
T: yeah they use them wrong.
I: another need of spell check.
Z: Ok
I: we need a, visitor at the door, that would be Z's friend.......  
(Z's roomate)
I: Ok, he just wants to hear his voice on the tape. Ok
T: OK, now we get to rate
Z: from one to three
T: Oh, can I just say one more thing about that other one? They didn't know how to use lose and loose. Did you notice that?
Z: yes.
T: oh, OK, that was it.
I: But you do, don't ya.
T: oh, you are too funny (laughter) He didn't read any of these, No I'm just kidding.
Z: we gotta rank these 1,2, and 3
I: No, I did, really! That's not nice!
Z: ok, rank em 1,2,3. 1 being the best, 3 being the worst.
T: Ok, what do you think?
I: personally, I think they all suck.
T: yeah.
I: see, they didn't, none of them seemed to appeal to all to me. One was like too boring, one was like too long, and the other one was just nothing
T: too many mistakes
I: yeah. If I say like, I'd have to say that definitely that one about the people in the wheelchair, I mean (laughter), in the electric chair
T: I told you he didn't read em.
I: I saw. Hey, you guys, I read those. You guys, I took a little while to read them
Z: I'll have to read these again I don't see a wheelchair.
T: wheelchair either.
I: The electric chair. The guy in the electric chair. If I get a bad grade for this it's your--(laughter)
Ok. The guy in the electric chair I thought that one was really bad.
Z: ok, ok, go on.
I: I say that one was 3, and then probably the environment one along with the wolves would be number 2 and then the tillage one, more boring would be number 1.
Z: OK
T: that's the same that I thought, exactly in an even line (laugh)
I: whisper (that's cause I read them)
Z: OK, I had the tillage one as one also, but I had the environment one as three.
T: oh really. why?
I: get out. (laugh)
(?)
Z: no wait, I had the wheelchair as
T: the wheelchair! (laugh) You guys are retarded!
Z: I's got me all messed up. I had the electric chair as 3 and yes, I had the ecosystem and the wolves as 2...
T: well we decided as ...
I: Why don't we all agree, in this great hour of our.....
Z: There's a wheelchair in one of these stories, //we got to find it
T: //we just got to find it.
I: Ok, real quick, sum up, OK. The electric chair is number 3, and then the wolves
T: // no--oh, right, sorry
I: //yeah, shut up (laugh). The wolves are number 2,
Z: and then ah, the ah minimum tillage //was number one
I: //the minimum tillage was number one.
T: I know
Z: yes
I: thank you. It's been fun being here
T: we deserve an A (laugh)
I: yes, we do.
Z: A
I: A
T: A
(laughter)
I: A, A, (half whisper)

End task two. Counter at 245.
Group 5

Group members: Class A
Erica (M), Jo (O), Adam (S), Bob (N)

Begin task one. Counter at 0.

M: This is group number one. We’re doing the criteria setting for paper number 6. OK...
S: Ok, what should be number one?
O: I think the most important is to have the thesis, and have it stated throughout the paper
S: the thesis.
O: Because?
M: put it at least
S: the argument, arguing for the thesis statement (laughter)
M: right
O: yes, exactly, good punctuation
N: Ok
S: punctuation, and grammatics, de nada (laugh) um
M: use MLA
O: include bibliography
S: proper documentation
O: yes, definitely.
S: um, let’s see, ah good organization throughout the paper. So that it flows right.
O: laugh
M: 10 sources...
S: right, with with a quote from each one.
O: /yep, a quote
M: /yeah, each one has to be documented
S: Ok....hm hm.
M: if you have any opposing arguments against it, make sure you present both sides of the
N: you don’t only address and use the opposing arguments.
M: true..
N: good point there.
O: laugh
M: try to find a variety a views on your topic.
S: ok......
M: let’s see what else.....um,
S: oh, and don’t, don’t be too harsh about the other topic, and uh, just like treat your opposition
poorly, you know
O: oh yeah, respect other people’s opinions
N: don’t make
S: it should be
O: keep your audience in mind.
S: right, right.
M: yeah, that’s a good one to address....
S: make sure you don’t have any, ah, fallacies in there
O: oh yeah
M: laugh
S: like, ah analogies that don’t quite work right and ah, what else, what other fallacies are there
N: Ad hominem?
S: yeah. Ad hominem something right.
O: laugh
M: laugh
N: or post hoc.
S: post hoc.
O: post hoc, yeah.
S: watch out for those, stick those in there, that's trouble......
M: well? You guys think there are any more?...
S: there's gotta be....
M and O: Laugh (?)
N: let's see...

End task one. Counter at 033.

Begin task two. Counter at 034.

O: ok, so we just go ahead and talk about the paper
N: sure
M: //papers
S: //the papers
laugh
O: Ok, how are we going to talk about the papers? (laughter)
M: which one should we start with?
O: well, you want to go around and just say what you guys ranked them as?
M: yeah. Why don't you go ahead, O?
O: Ok, well the order I put them in, I thought the best one was, urn, "knowledge calls for freedom,"
the one that was about the censoring of the book or whatever.
M: um hmm
O: and then the second was population growth, and then the spotted owl. (laugh)
M: laugh.
O: that was the last one.
M: I did just the opposite of you, I got the spotted owl one as the best, but, I'll I'll explain it later
(laughter--could not understand)
O: hey, that's ok.
M: the population control was second and then I thought the worst one was Johnny going to the
library (laughter in the group)
O: ok, S, what do you think?
S: ok. I'd have to say the population one,
O: was the best one?
S: was the best one. ...And ah, the knowledge calls for freedom second and the spotted owl would
have to be the last of the herd (laugh).
O: really
N: I agree, I have the spotted owl last,
S: that's fine
N: the book censoring second, but I thought the best one was about population growth. ...
O: ok
M: Ok, well we disagree but, cool
O: ok, now we gotta figure out why and stuff....
M: well,
O: I just thought that the spotted owl was like (laughter), no seriously, I definitely put it last because it, I felt like it was more talking about the forest and like what could be done to keep the forest going and it wasn't really talking about the owl, and,
M: well that's true. The reason I put it first was because I thought it was the best paper as far as content
O: yeah
M: because the other two I just thought were ridiculous. Um, it didn't follow its thesis and it was, and I, like you said earlier, it would have been a really good paper for the um, the forest thing.
O: um hm
M: but I thought it was the best as far as actual writing and content, the other two, I just, I don't know.
O: laugh
S: so tell us about this Johnny goes to the library one
M: oh, it's so bad. That was like in the first paragraph or something.
O: yeah
S: yeah
M: yeah, Johnny arrives at the school library. I thought that the writing style was really really simple I had a hard time believing it.
O: yeah, I guess I can agree, I mean, I guess I can agree with that I guess it is kind of simple but I thought it was kind of a neat perspective too. Because I thought, you know, it's true, the way, I mean, that they, just take books off the shelf and
M: Yeah, I agree with that, I, just totally just thought that their writing style was sooo simple and they were stuck on saying the same thing, over and over and over again. They really didn't have an argument
O: yeah
N: One thing I noticed is I think, at least one time that even though technically the sentences don't contradict themselves, there's like two sentences right in a row that the feeling you get from the sentence kind of contradicts what it said right before it.
O: um hmhm
M: I was really unimpressed with their informal writing style, I wrote down, that, "Since when have writers been afraid of being creative?" because
O: ha
M: he kept asking these questions that were like, duh (laughter). It was really informal
O: um hmhm, yeah, I can, I agree with that. I don't know, I just thought it, when I was reading it, it just sounded so much better than that spotted owl.
S: OK
O: I think it's because I read the spotted owl first,
M: uh huh, yeah, that could be, //cuz I read that Johnny one first
O: //It could be the order that you read them in. uh huh
M: (?)
O: I mean, I agree with you that it's pretty simple. I hadn't really thought of it that way. Cause this is supposed to be a pretty formal paper.
M: right. I didn't think that-
N: the one that really, made me wonder is "I understand that a reader may wish to ban a book if he found it offensive and so do many other readers. However I do not think that the banning of that book or any others is permissible." See that's kind of (laughter)
S: it's kind of a
O: very, it's contradicting
M: (?)......
O: I don't know, we really haven't talked about the population paper.
M: uh uh. I can't remember that one very well...
O: they just talked about the different things that affect the population. I thought it had some pretty good, I mean, they kept the comments in there that were really important and they said why there were problems with population things and they kept comparing them to other countries and...I really thought that was good. They had good content.
N: well personally, I found that population paper was the best but personally I disagree with, that was the one I disagreed with the most.
M: laugh
N: but, I, ah, found a lot of arguments that like weren't presented but I think they presented their argument best.
M: I thought that in the conc-I can't remember where it exactly was but I wrote in the conclusion they had a radical thesis with no back up. I don't, that's what I thought. I don't know. (?)
S: What is the thesis exactly.
N: that we have to start controlling the population, just like China's controlling their population. The only thing I found that made me wonder is the fact that China has a very dense population, and the US has like, no density
M: yeah
O: um hmm
N: to its population.....
M: I also wrote down that they had lots of run on sentences in it (laughter in group)
O: I know that's what I noticed too, they needed, like a period and //they'd start another sentence
M: //and they just went on and on
O: that happened in all of them though
M: those papers were just frustrating me, I don't know
O: I wanted to mark them up
M: I did too, I was really
O: I was wantin to put commas in, and
S: they are rough drafts.
O: I know, //but still
M: //but that's just like, really rough, like fourth grade grammar
S: laugh, ouch. ooh
M: I know
O: I'm glad this isn't in our own class
M: I know, I was just really unimpressed...I'm sorry if I hurt someone.
S: ha, it's probably like your best friend or something
O: ha ha ha...I don't know, we we have to try to come to a decision in what, I mean, together, don't we?
M: sure. How are we going to do that?
S: yeah....
O: um.............
N: they all have major problems; which problem is the worst.
M: that's exactly right. I guess I don't have a real strong opinion about any of em. I said I was really unimpressed with all of em, like O said, I was just really tempted to mark them up, it was frustrating, but
S: well I think I could maybe drop the population one down to second
M: laugh
S: because ah, what you said about the run in, run on sentences and stuff, that, I think this person did their homework, I mean
M: laugh, yeah
O: I mean, really the person that did the spotted owl paper did too.
M: they had good
S: yeah, but
O: you could tell it was a very educated paper but it wasn't
S: the thesis was
M: it was not organized
O: it was confusing, yeah, cuz you didn't, it, it was hard to follow, because,
N: gotta change the thesis
O: yeah
M: and they didn't use the right form for the bibliography, not works cited...that's not very
S: I... loot
M: it was not organized
O: well, everybody's picking him apart. (laughter)
S: can we just like, give it a three way tie, here? (laughter)
M: no way....
S: we're being so mean, it's terrible. No
O: hey, it's constructive criticism
N: I didn't like any of em.
O: huh? I, well, I know, but we have to try to come up with
M: something
N: no!....
O: well, do we agree to put like the population one in the middle? Or do we pick that one first?...
N: let's put it this way, do we, what do we agree with the spotted owl?....
M: I don't care.
S: well, if we put, if we put the population one in the middle then that means either
O: spotted owl// or John
M: //or Johnny
S: Johnny arrives at the school library (laughter)
M: no, please, no.
S: spotted owl is first.
O: I kind of agree with Emilie on that now that she said that. I don't know, I just, it was, this was
the "knowledge calls for freedom" was the last one I read. And it, after these two, you know, it
was kind a like
M: it sounded better
O: I don't know, it was kind of cool. (laughter) cuz it was a different approach, maybe that, I mean
it probably does depend on what order you read them in.
M: I think it probably does....
N: I can't remember what order I read them in...I just read em....
M: I just really hated Johnny (laughter). Sorry. I hope that, the other class doesn't look into these
tapes or anything.
O: well we hated your paper.
S: laugh
M: I think it has room to get better if they wanted to work with it, but just right now it needs a lot
of work. //I don't want to say it's terrible
N: well considering these, these papers were supposed to be, like, basically finished
M: finished, right
O: yeah
M: I just really, had, like I started to say, I think I was really surprised that these people were in
105. I just, I don't know, It just didn't seem like any of them were fine...maybe I'm just
O: Ok, let's come to a decision
M: ok
O: should we take a vote...
M: sure (laughter)
S: ok (laugh)
O: I don't know. Well, we gotta try to figure these out here. So we're, are you guys like totally against the spotted owl, then?
N: The only reason I'm against it is the fact that its thesis has nothing to do with what it's arguing about.
O: yeah, I agree with you
M: that's definitely true. I don't know. I think it's hard to put them in any kind of order because
O: um hmm
M: I mean if we can agree that the population one goes in the middle, the other two have major downfalls which is different for (?) what's more important. The spotted owl
O: maybe we should put the population one first...
M: laugh
O: I know, it's really, it's really hard
M: it is hard
O: when you don't really like any of them..
S: so let's just, just take a vote...raise your hand if you think spotted owl should be first....ok,
M: oh, I do! (laugh)
S: ok, ah, Johnny rides at the school library
M: Ok, I'm outnumbered. Population. Number one. (laughter)
S: Ok, we got rid of that one now.....I think, I think spotted owl should be second at least
M: hm , ok, thanks, guys.
S: ok
O: it needs to change the thesis
M: easier to understand
O: at the
N: it would be good
M: Johnny just needs a little work
N: ok.
M: that's number three.
O: ok
N: there you go
O: that sounds like a good idea
S: but, we forgot to rank our criteria (laughter). 1 being the most important. We're supposed to rank our criteria in order.
M: oh
O: our criteria for our papers?
S: yeah, what we came up with
O: Oh
S: a long time ago, on this tape (laughter). Talk about being unorganized.
O: ok
S: ok now we're back to this criteria thing (laughter)
M: sorry. (laughter)....
N: I think organization should be number one.
M: I think so too
S: even before thesis?
Group: uh
Laugh
M: the thesis really is the paper, you know.
O: the thesis is, I feel that way.
M: strong papers //carry those out, that's it, you know
S: //I say thesis. I say thesis number one....(laugh)
O: I can't decide
S: cause your organization kinda depends on your thesis, too
M: organization can be number 2
O: yeah
S: Ok
O: number three...grammatical things
M: oh wait
N: mechanics should be like, last cause it has nothing to do with argument, //it just makes it look pretty
O:  //not the content of it,
yeah
S: so like,
M: so we only need three? 1 is the highest, 3 is the lowest...
S: so maybe content and documentation next? I mean
M: not content. Isn't content, like always in..
S: or like, your research and how you
O: yeah
S: used it in the paper..
M: ok
S: I mean, that's pretty general, but, and then mechanics
O: yeah, cuz mechanics are important, they're not that important.
M: hopefully that (?)
O: I know. I mean, this is more like the first paper is, I felt
M: um hm
O: oh well.
S: ok
M: did we do everything we were supposed to do?
S: I think we have it.
M: ok.
S: I think we've got it covered.
O: alright.....

End task two. Counter on 178.
Group 6

Group members: Class B
Jane (H), Jim (M), Rick (R)

Begin task one. Counter at 0.

M: English 105. Lee-Ann Kastman. Presentations and tape recording. Evaluation for Paper 6.... That was fun. I'm M!
H: I'm H.
R: R.
M: Ah, that's us. I'm turning this down. This is too loud. OK. Egge isn't here. I think she's skipping. She's probably shopping. OK. For part one, for task one of our tape, tape for final exam, we are going to discuss our criteria, for paper 6. We may add criteria that is not included on the assignment sheet. ... We will not get this tape back. (laugh) Ok let's start. I think one of the most important criteria of this was the 10 sources. Because for our annotated bibliography we had to have 10 sources. And I think our paper should include the 10 sources that we used for our annotated bibliography. Do you agree with me?
H: Yes.
M: Why?
H: Because we went to all the work for the annotated bibliography. We should use it all in our= M: It was hard work, wasn't it.
H: Yes.
M: Did you think it was hard work?
R: Yes, I did.
M: Just penetrating. OK, let's go on to, why don't you give me what you think a good criteria is.
H: I think one would be if we include the writer's point of view (laugh). Because this is important in any paper if we want to make it a good paper...
R: Well M, the 10 sources was important but however I don't think it's the most important.
M: I never said it was. I just started us off. I started the ball rolling.
R: OK, well ah, H had a good point, the writer's point of view. We don't want to ah use the other author's ah, own words, which is another important aspect of our papers. Um, I would say organization would be the ah most important. Do you agree?
H: Yes, that's an important fact too I guess.
R: Well thank you. Um, and also thesis is a very important ah part of our criteria for our paper. And ah, we don't contradict our thesis throughout. M, ah, what do you think?
M: I agree with what you said. The writer's point of view, excuse me, I was just drinking, the writer's point of view is very important to using this. I think another very, and probably one of the most important things, is the thesis... The thesis=
R: Why is that, M?
M: I think the thesis is important because um, when you have the, the author's thesis, that sets the tone of the entire paper, and their paper has to match their thesis. So if they say they don't agree with the topic like abortion, then their whole paper has to deal with that. So one, small statement can affect an entire person's paper.
R: Good.
M: My Barney doll will talk for a while.
H: Good job.
M: Thank you. I feel your support and love. What about you?...
H: I don't know. Although we need um, a thesis I think we also need to show both sides of the, of view and have multiple views so that we don't just have our own opinion.
M: I agree with the multiple views thing. There are many views to everything.
H: Yes.
M: And in order to make your view better, usually if you show the other side point of view you can make your side look stronger. Don't you agree?
R: I agree totally.
M: How totally do you agree?
R: 100 percent.
M: That's a lot.
R: Yes.
M: OK.
R: Can we think of any more criteria?
M: What about using the MLA.
H: Oh, that's a good idea.
M: Yeah, I'm so glad I thought of that. Do you remember what that is?
H: Yes.
M: Refresh whoever is listening to this tape just so they remember.
H: The MLA is a handbook on how to doc-, tells us how to document sources. Like the bibliography which is another important thing that needs to be included. And the parenthetical documentation so we don't get, caught with plagiarism, or, charged with plagiarism. We have to document.
M: I'd hate to be arrested and charged with plagiarism (laughter) because I copied part of my English paper. I would feel bad. What other criteria? What about grammar?
R: Grammar
H: Yeah, Oh.
M: Grammar, yes, grammar is good. Grammar is very good.
H: Good idea. Good idea.
R: We've noticed how that can affect a very good paper. Like our ah, second part of this task.
M: You can have a very good paper and completely screw up the grammar and just get completely flushed on your grade.
R: Yes.
M: Leading to many other problems such as eating disorder and alcoholism just because of bad grades due to grammar. So if you just use your spell check on your computer....
R: um hmm?
M: Um hmm. Um hmm? I agree. Is there any other criterias we have not yet covered.....Let's see, we covered the 10 sources, // the writer's point of view.
R: //Is there any we can think of that are not on the list?
M: Let's recap what we've done so far...
R: Let's go over.
M: For task one=
R: We've had our 10 sources we talked about, the writer's point of view, the grammar, organization, our thesis statement, multiple views, the MLA documentation, and our bibliography... Can you think of any others off hand.
H: No. Um, maybe we should say what is the most important. Of all of those.
R: We need to reach a conclusion on what's most important.
M: I have another one, though.
R: Ok, let's hear it.
H: Oh.
M: It's my own personal baby that I like. I'd say the paper's subject....
R: The topic?
M: The topic must be interesting. Must be interesting because if you have an uninteresting topic you're more
R: Give us an example.
M: A good example is, at one time I read this thing on soil tillage.
R: Yeah. (?)
M: And, I mean, there were some facts in it, but everything was just so annoying because the topic was so annoying and I, I just wanted to put it down so fast and just not read it and watch Oprah or something. Because, it was just—You have to have a good topic, something captivating like mine, or yours, or yours.
H: I agree.
R: Yeah.
M: uh huh. Ok, let's decide which one is the best, shall we? Yes... I would say organization.
H: Organization.
R: I'm gonna have to agree with you there, M.
M: I agree too! Playing the part of Egge today is Barney......... (laughter) My water just fell over. Don't worry this is the eighth time we've dumped it over today....... (?) That's for the presentation. Now we're going to go to a commercial break.

End task one. Counter at 105.

(Barney song)

Note: there is a lot of background talk in this tape that I have not been able to decipher. Those places are indicated by (?) in the transcripts. The words recorded here are, however, as accurate as I could record.

Begin task two. Counter at 111.

M: That was enough. Now we're back from our commercial.
R: Task number two.
M: We're going on to task number two........
H: For task number two, we need to read three papers, and rank them according to how well they fit the criteria we have previously established. In other words, we get to be the graders. Um, we need to um, rank these papers with one being the best and three being the worst... And so we'll get started. We have, um, a paper about capital punishment. About=
M: Let's discuss that paper first.
H: Wolves, and about Minimum tillage for soil.. Let's see.. Let's start out with the paper with min--about capital punishment.....
R: Let's start with the worst...
H: OK, we'll start with minimum tillage.... To me, ok, to me this paper was kind of boring because it doesn't really affect, it affects everybody but it's not interesting to everybody.. So I think the writer needed to chose maybe another topic that would keep the reader interested in the subject. . What did you think about it.
R: Well good point. The topic itself wasn't one that most people were going to find very interesting.. Um, his opening paragraph isn't very stimulating or catching in any kinda way to his audience. He just jumps right in about soil, and it's, huh, most people are gonna, not really read this too much. He ah, his grammar was pretty good throughout, I didn't see any real errors that way, but it just wasn't very catching, really. It was very dull throughout, I thought. M?
M: One of my personal pet peaves that really erked me off when I read this paper was after looking through at all the ah, oh, what do you call em..
H: documentation
R: ah, yes, of course
M: documentation, Internal documentation, almost his entire paper was plagiarized.
R: Good point, M.
M: The author did give some of some of his or her own views (I'm pretty sure it was a he, cause not many girls are interested in soil tillage, I'm not being sexist)
R: Yes, you were there, M.
M: I'm sorry. Um, but, ah, the author, for lack of a better word, just almost his entire thing is all one quote out of a after another after another all taken out of other people's work and that's just complete plagiarism, I mean, I'm looking through this whole thing and I think there are probably about three paragraphs this person wrote on their own and that is bad. Bad is not good. Let's move on to our next paper.. Which is, wolves. (laughter).. I've never seen Dances With Wolves, but
H: (?)
R: He does that in every single paragraph.
M: The wolf paper. It starts out, it's a very taunting subject. It talks about "The environment is part of our every day existance, no matter.." and it just goes on, and it talks about different animals, and and then suddenly it talks about the ultimate place is national is Yellowstone.
R: There's an exclamation point behind there
M: (fighting for the floor) And then, I don't, and that is Yellowstone National park! Woa!
R: (?)
M: And then it's exciting, and then you think the paper is about how good Yellowstone is and then suddenly it's "I believe that the wolves should be introduced into Yellowstone." Um, there's not tons and tons and tons of internal documentation. But I think the beginning of the paper is very misleading and,.. bad. It's bad.
H: Is it--
R: Did you think it was too long for his thesis, is that it?
M: Yes.
H: I agree with you... Um, I...(laugh) I agree with, Ok, I agree with you, that um, he needed to do his thesis alot earlier in the paper because you get to be thinking that this paper is gonna be about Yellowstone National Park and it turns out to be
M: wolves.
H: wolves. And, again, this isn't a very. It's an interesting topic for some people but for some they just don't really care. Like,....
(laugh)
R: Well,... well I think he did a good job of ah, well, again, he kind of has a lot of documentation through here, throughout, but
M: Not as bad as the first paper.
R: No, not as bad, but you had a good point about his ah misleading introduction.
M: There was another part of the paper that was really misleading.
R: Well, let's hear about it.
M: I don't remember where it was, though.... He talks about, "I believe the wolves should be reintroduced into Yellowstone National park" but later on he talks about how a wolf, wolves attack livestock, they've attacked park rangers, and all this other stuff. And then he starts talking about disease and the real hunter, and it's like what? do you mean. I think this person was semi-intoxicated. (others laugh). Um, there's part of this paper that do not match up. I mean, it says like hunters don't like wolves, but then they do, but park rangers don't like wolves, but they do, and this was just, this was just a bad paper. But it wasn't as bad because in this one the person made up some of their own stuff... OK.
H: So, I think with our criteria I think the major problem was that this person had was with organization which was our main
R: very good, very good
H: which was our main point or main criteria.
M: Bad organization.
H: which bad organization leads to a bad paper.
M: Which leads to a bad grade which leads to personal problems. We should remember this.
(laughter).
R: Ok, let's go on to what we like the best here.
M: We'll have you start out this paper.
R: Ok. Well this was about capital punishment here. And ah the writer from the very beginning starts off gets the, talks about um, well being electrocuted I guess. And it gets the interest of the readers, but ah, let's see here. He has good organization throughout, I think. He has his own views--
M: He is sexist.
R: He or she. Thank you M.
M: Shall we use it?
R: laugh. And uh, his thesis is pretty clear throughout that he is against ah capital punishment and you can pretty much see that all the way through and he states his opinion. However, he has a little bit of a problem with grammar. His spelling, I don't think he ah used the spell check as M mentioned //before
M: //bad
R: on his computer.. Um, now what do you think? Ah, H, about this paper?
H: I think this is a good paper. Um, with the little, the beginning of it with John Doe sitting in a one man room and then going on to how they'd hook him up to the electric chair and then he's pronounced dead by the government and the United States of America. It kind of--In the first couple paragraphs it tells us about this person's paper and what their view is on it, without even going into the first paragraph on the second page of which where the writer states their thesis. And the grammar is kinda bad in this paper which would be another one of our important criteria that meets that needed to be done.
M: I personally found the paper quite captivating and I just couldn't put it down. And I just read and read and read until I was done. And then I read it again. The paper is quite interesting because the author, he or she, does give interesting views on capital punishment, because at first you're not really sure what the paper starts out about. And then you end up finding out what it's about. And he or she gave really good reasons on how um, one I found really good was that a person can be, OK, "according to United States law one person taking the life of another person is considered murder. So the enforcement of capital punishments should be considered murder." Two wrongs don't make a right.
R: That's true, M..
M: Though I do believe that if, I don't personally agree with the author, but, I do think that he or she did a very good paper. Used some very nice big words, and it just was professionally done except for some of the typos like cot. They spelled cot wrong.
R: They opened up the very first paragraph with a spelling error.
M: The the--that was kind of a let down. It was a big let down. Boo hoo... So, let's recapitivate.
Our three papers which were:
H: Soil tillage
M: Two.
H: Wolves
M: Three.
H: and Capital punishment.
M: And we figure, which one was the best?
H: Capital punishment.
M: Number three. Second runner up?
H: Would be, um, wolves.
M: And the bad paper?
H: Soil tillage.
M: Hmm. Hopefully this person passes English (laughter). Well, is there anything else we have to say over this?
H: No.
R: I don't believe so M.
M: I thought it was fun. I'd like to thank the teacher for giving us a chance for us to meet on an afternoon and do something besides sleep and do something that's actually for a class and was kind of fun. And we'll close with Barney's "I love You" song. (song)

End task two. Counter on 295.
Group 7

Group members: Class A
   Marie (P), Tom (Q), Jamie (J)

Begin task one. Counter at 0.

P: //task one
J: //task one
P: kay, um, for criteria I thought that you should include that you had to have at least 10 sources.
J: OK.
P: um, have a good strong introduction and tell your point of view or what you want to / /present throughout your paper
J: //state your thesis?
P: Your idea, yeah state your thesis
J: kay.
P: um, use documentation when necessary I thought that was very important
J: um hhm
P: um, cuz its MLA form.
J: ok
P: um, present multiple views
J: ok.
P: organize sections, organization, basically
J: um hhm.
P: um, mechanics, spelling grammar, that kind of thing.
J: ok. Another thing I, I'm gonna add to your total list is um transitions between paragraphs and sticking to the thesis, um... Do you know what I mean?
P: yeah, throughout the paragraph, right?
J: right, like throughout the paper without running off onto a tangent about different piddly things.
Q: then it helps to repeat the thesis throughout the paper so the reader doesn't forget about what the writer is trying to talk about.
P: yeah, that's important.
J: Good.
P: kay
J: moving on.....

(Tape keeps rolling, but moving on to task number 2 without an announcement. Counter at 014)

P: um, I did on paper for knowledge calls for freedom what to you want to say, like what we ranked it and why?..
J: yep
P: kay I thought it deserved a 1. And =
J: What about Q? Or do you agree?
Q: um, I think I gave that one a 2.
J: Ok, I gave it a 1. So why would it rather be (?) laugh
P: Ok, I gave it a 1 because um, I thought it was a good intro, cuz they used a hypothetical example, and that was a good attention getter. Um, I thought that it was good because he asks a lot of opinionated questions for the reader. And the paragraph length was consistent throughout the paper, it didn't have one long paragraph and then a short one and a long one or, it was very consistent and I thought that was really good cuz that was, it was easier to follow um, it fit the
criteria for the number of sources. He had or he or she had 10 sources and, it was quite clear what
their opinion was about the topic. Um, ...what else?...He used quotes, he or she used quotes and
facts which added to the credential of the paper, and used MLA form and documentation. And all
in all I thought he used pretty good mechanics.
J: OK, I liked it um, I also gave it a 1 um, what I liked about it was...he stated the thesis, and stuck
to it and um, presented his the argument in order in which it was stated in the thesis, and it ah
gave multiple views, and, I mean, OK, so it gave multiple views and the paragraphs were
consistent and ah, it was easy to follow, there were transitions between paragraphs and, one thing I
noticed was um, it was a little bit stronger than the other two because it would direct, it would talk
more to people as a group rather than say you or us or I to know more than,
P: um hmm, right
J: well, I mean, every now and then they slipped up and said I know you know and stuff like that is
not necessary in writing because I think it makes the paper weaker, but um, as far as punctuation
and ah, grammar and all that kind of thing this paper was um, by far, I thought, more organized
than the other two.
P: Q!
Q: You want me to talk about the one that I picked as the number one choice?
J: no, you gave it a two "Knowledge calls for freedom"
Q: Well, I didn't know if you wanted me to talk about the spotted owl.
P: yeah you say why you thought that
J: why you gave that a 2.
Q: Oh, Ok, why I gave that a 2. Um, well, it was a toss up. Ah, between this one and the spotted
owl paper. and I thought that the spotted owl one was better, um,...Basically I like the way it
stated the opposition and then it ah, it proved, and then the person proved his point against the
opposition gave facts, which supported his statement. And, ....that's the main thing that caught
me, and he repeated his thesis. So,
P: You're talking about the spotted owl?
Q: yeah, the spotted owl.
P: kay.
Q: Yeah, it was a pretty well known, the thesis was pretty well known throughout the paper.
P: OK, I gave the spotted owl a 2. I thought it was pretty good, um, compared to the first one,"Knowledge calls for freedom" I gave the spotted owl a 2 because paragraph length, it was very
inconsistent, um, few spelling errors, but that's minor. Wasn't really important. But, if I had to
come compare I'd give that one a 2 before I would any of the other ones. That's basically the only reason
I gave it a 2.
J: I agree with you on the ah, spotted owl being a 2 because of the paragraph consistency. Um, it,
the first one I gave a 1 "Knowledge calls for freedom" was a lot easier to follow because the
paragraphs were smaller
P: right
J: and it had a topic sentence that
P: uh huh
J: you know, and this is like, it's like
P: it's like a run-on
J: yeah, it's like reading something continuously going OK, when do I breathe?
P: right
J: you know and it's easier to get lost
P: right
J: reading something that's still run together, so,
P: ok, and what about that third paper?
Q: we all gave the
J: third paper.
Q: population one, three?
J: /uh huh
P: //yeah. I think we all had the same opinion on that, so.
J: OK, this paper drove me nuts. This was definitely a 3. um, I thought the sentences were...I don't
know, some of them could have been combined to make. Oh, they use too many words to say
P: the same thing?
J: the, to say the same thing, and to say something basic. Like for example, a serious problem in
today's society is population growth. And then, you know, and then it just goes on "Many
researchers agree that if population continues to grow we'll have a serious (?)" OK, that was good I
guess it elaborated little bit more but I didn't think it was all that necessary to do so much. And
um, like it would say, it would give an example of something that was like "what effects have
factors had on our society." Well what exactly do they consider factors. Do you know what I mean?
P: um hmm
J: just, different things that were misleading and just didn't go together smoothly. And the
paragraphs were a mess, and the ideas, um, it jumped all over the place with um, the idea of um,
um, solutions to the world's population problem to, and they talked about America's population
problem as opposed to the world population problem where in the beg, in the introduction you'd
think that they were talking about the government, then they start going into third world countries
and all this stuff. It wasn't focused, and the transitions between paragraphs were horrible.. And
ah,, I don't know what else to say.
Q: I agree with following the paragraphs
J: um hm
Q: it was kind of jumpy...and I thought, I didn't think it pointed out too many ah, opposing
statements. They just basically gave one side.
J: That's a good point.
Q: Yeah, that was that overpopulation is, will occur if we don't do something about it.
J: right...um hmm...it didn't present other factors that could also have an impact on the different
areas. They use, um, every now and then they'd slip up and use some pretty informal language like,
um, "going to get rooted back to the wild west" and I thought that was kind of, huh (laugh). I
mean, really.
P: (laugh)
Q: you like that, huh?
J: yeah I did, I mean, that's how I talk, I like that, but in here in a paper you just don't say that.
P: sure
J: and my different things, and that could have been put in the introduction to make it, I guess the
my biggest problem I had with this paper is I didn't know what they were talking about or where
they wanted to go with it. And so every time I read a new paragraph I was going, OK, so this is the
problem, you know. It just um, and it was one sided. Very one sided. Anybody else?
P: I agree with everything you said.
J: oh, well that was easy for you!
P: no, I'm serious, I was listening very attentively and you covered it all
J: ok
P: so it'd be just like, referring to the same thing.
J: oh, and another thing that bothered me about this paper is I thought it sounded really weak
because they're going through saying well this is the problem and this is what should be done about
it but then they'd say something like, I'd like to figure out how, there's no way we could
accomodate, or just things like, um, oh here's a quote that was, slaughtered. Slashed.
P: hm
J: I mean that doesn't even make sense.
P: But was there-
J: "Women having the children are the ones that cannot raise them." Right? does that make sense it makes sense to me that's like, awkward sentences.
P: that makes sense.
J: it does?
P: like, well, a little, cuz if a woman has a child and she can't raise him, I mean,
J: well I guess it didn't make sense with the paragraph, I guess is what I meant
P: the sentence makes sense, though
J: well ok, so fine the sentence makes sense.
P: laugh
J: but like all these periods before that, that's not necessary is it?
P: well if there's
Q: it shows that they're
J: punctuation
P: no but, it shows that there's words missing.
Q: yeah, they didn't use the whole thing
J: OK, foot in the mouth.
P: laugh
J: uh huh, OK...
P: do you have anything to add Q?
Q: ah....I agree with everything she said.
P: she covered everything,
Q: laugh
P: she goes on and on, so what do we have left to present?
J: ok, well, did I mention I don't remember if I mentioned this thing about China that they threw in there. I, yeah, I guess my biggest problem is it just, it wasn't together. That's not very specific, but, um,...the different solutions well this is a solution this is what we should do. But yet, they were talking about the world and they were talking about America, and they tried to mix the two together and they just, it was one mess.
P: kay
J: are we done?
P: I think so.
J: alright
Q: I'm done
P: kay, good job guys.

End task 2. Counter at 129.
Group 8

Group members: Class A
Scott (R), Corbett (L), Daniel (V), Cori (Y)

Begin task one. Counter at 000.

L: For the final paper number one would be to get started long before the paper is due so you don't end up getting an hour and a half of sleep. Um, our second criteria was, um, what was it.
V: um, make sure you have a clearly stated thesis. Want to make sure everybody knows exactly what you're trying to write your paper about.
L: ok, yeah and then we also decided that correctness, um, grammar correctness that is, is also //important
V: //important, yeah punctuation's part of grammar.... all (?)
V: and when you, when you get your paper printed off you want to make sure you tear off those little holes on the side of the computer paper....
L: kay also when you write your paper you should ask yourself, or your paper should be able to answer some of the following questions on "What do I really want to say about this topic? and How does the source relate to my thesis?" ..
Y: yes, I think that's important because sometimes sources don't directly relate to a thesis if you change it, since, you started researching. You gotta make sure you're not just using the source...
V: you gotta, you want to include both points of view or all points of view on your topic. You don't want to, you want to make sure you show all the multiple, multiple view points
Y: if, if you have //multiple view points
V: //and give them, and give them credit. Well yeah, but most topics do. You want to make sure you refute them without totally making them look like they're no good....
R: and
L: ok, who should our audience be then.
R: what?
V: sorry
L: should it be the class, or
Y: well, it=
V: it depends on your paper and topic
R: yeah, whoever you want it to be..
V: it depends if you have like, a national topic or a local topic. Obviously if you're talking about something in Ames, the government's not going to care about it...
R: true true.
Y: very true.
L: so the,
G: bravo...
L: so the audience should be...
V: you have to, um, you //have to determine your audience based on what your topic is..
R: //depends on your paper.
Y: and then you have to consider your audience's beliefs and how you,
V: and then try to change them if you want to..if you want// to persuade them
R: //that's the whole point of the paper
Y: or else clarify the issue........um, let's see....what=
L: oh, include a bibliography at the end..
V: yeah, that's a good idea. And make sure when you use your, your MLA documentation have it in parenthesis and you put the period afterwards and there's no comma between the author and the page number.
L: um, you also have to have 10 sources with, we already said that they need to have different viewpoints, so
V: and you're supposed to try to use something from every source in your paper somewhere at least once.
Y: and with this length of a paper, um, it's easy to get lots of thoughts jumbled, together so you need to be careful on your organization that you don't repeat things, or, =
V: well you want to repeat the important stuff.
Y: well, yeah........

Stop tape. End task one. Counter at 043.

Begin task two. Counter at 044

L: OK, alright, we're here to
R: rank the papers
L: rank the papers and =
V: taping session number two
L: yes, um, to see if these papers have a lot of the criteria, see which ones match up with a lot of the criterias, and, figure out which paper's the best. So the first one we'll look at is "knowledge calls for freedom." Um, I personally thought it was one of the better papers because it included 10 different sources and they had many multiple views, um, It had a really interesting introduction which was really good.
V: it was good, well organized
L: yeah
Y: well I wasn't. The organization was OK, but
V: I thought it was pretty darn good myself.
L: OK?
R: I agree with you.
Y: well, um, well, but I thought that the person who wrote this kind of ah jumped back and forth, like they repeated their arguments and, uh, but I don't know, I think it was better than the other two.
V: you have to stress your arguments, though. You have to repeat em.
Y: yeah but, it was, it was, it had no flow. But
V: I thought it flowed like a river. (laughter)
L: anyway, our I thought the organization was pretty good because, even though it jumped a little, sometimes that's good because if you get going on a point and no one agrees with it, then you can jump back to your original point that you made
V: yeah
L: to remind them that hey, this is what's going on here. This is what's important,
V: and
L: that paper did that.....
V: that was //basically written well, too, I mean,
Y: //I was, hmmm
L: expression was well
V: the sentence structure, everything was great.
Y: I ah, I wasn't sure if um, they really went to the....
L: what was that?
Y: I wasn't sure if they really went to the core of the argument. They really didn't address why people wanted certain books censored, they just kept saying well you shouldn't censor books, well, why did these people want, or whatever was being censored, why did they want it to be censored.
V: too difficult! I'm sorry
Y: why not? //I mean that's the whole point
V: //it's an argument paper
Y: wait, it's not like people just go around saying, oh burn that book, there's a reason behind it, and I didn't think that they really addressed that. But anyways we still have to go on
R: I think that's part of his point. Some people don't have any reason behind it
L: yeah,
R: they just burn em without reading em, and, his point, whoever's, the author's point
L: I think a lot of people didn't just go out and burn books just because everyone else does it. So
V: I think you're right.
L: so, I don't know, just cuz he didn't, or she,
R: the author
L: the author. It can be he, when you're talking about someone unknown you use the
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L: anyway I think this, um, author, um, doesn't really need to present all of the opposing view. I mean, he can only, he's only puts in what he wants to put in as an opposing view, so,
V: that's what you're supposed to do
L: As long as he organizes his view, which he did, and put in minimal amount of the opposing view, I think it's alright.
V: yeah, you just gotta give them a little credit, but you don't want to use them too much or you're gonna weaken your own argument.
Y: well personally it didn't address my objections against, and ah
V: well then you're getting into disagreeing with their view points
Y: no, no that's not what I'm talking about.
V: ok.
R: I think we should move on to the next paper.
V: Well I give it a 2 thumbs up. what about you, Ebert?
L: I will give it the thumbs up.
Y: good.
L: alright, the next paper is the one about the Spotted owl! And I (laughter) thought that the spotted owl. I thought the spotted owl (who who in the background) paper was really, I don't know, I didn't think it was very good
Y: they, well they used a lot of information, though.//I thought that was pretty good
V: //I think they're grammatically challenged
(laughter)
L: I think that they overdid their use of sources. I love it, ah, they went on here, they had the program's success didn't hold, though due to poor administrative techniques and biological insufficiency, which is probably basic knowledge. I mean, then they put in a source, in 1985.
Y: well they were just being careful
R: yeah
L: overly careful, I mean this stuff is
Y: yeah, but they did use a lot of information
L: this is more historical
R: that makes the paper more believable, cite a bunch of sources
Y: // yeah, in fact I don't know maybe we should put this one first
L: cite a bunch of historical sources
V: what did you want to do?
Y: put this one first.
R: /the spotted owl?!
V: no way! Not a chance!
Y: this one gives, I mean,
L: change the paper about censorship (?)
Y: I thought neither of them flowed very smoothly but the spotted owl had more basis for its argument...........
V: well, I disagree. I just have to... The spotted owl=
Y: why do you disagree?
V: it just wasn't very good.
Y: why?
V: well, I have to think about that for a second.. (laughter)
L: I thought it was, I don't know, I like the censorship one better because it flowed more smoothly mainly because he presented his views and mixed in the opposing views every once in a while. This guy went his views, opposing views
Y: no, oh, well but they did put the opposing views
L: /it was like block and block of information
Y: are you sure about that?
V: actually I don't think the spotted owl paper had a lot of the opposing view in it.
L: /yeah it did
Y: /yeah it did, they talked about the loggers losing their jobs//and it talks about
V: //That's about it that's about all I ever saw
Y: um, let's see they talked about...
R: well you don't want to put too much opposing view into it..
L: no
Y: losing the old p-or, thinking that's it's OK to use the old forests because the new ones can grow faster...and I don't know what else........
R: well we're all in agreement that the other one comes in last, I think
V: well, should we rank this one second then?
R: spotted owl
L: she wants it first.
Y: I'll concede.
V: OK, thanks for conceding.
L: alright.
V: ok, now this ah, population control.
L: population control sucks (laughter)
V: I'll have to agree with you there.
Y: but maybe it's because we didn't understand the logic.
V: no it's completely disorganized.
L: it didn't flow, because I didn't, I was on one subject, it was flowing really nice then all of a sudden I was like, totally confused because they started filling in some figures that I didn't think even went with the thesis they were talking about...
V: find it....
L: doesn't matter if I find it or not, but, I didn't think it flowed well because of that reason....... 
Y: I think they kind of used ah, their arguments were a little too complex and they didn't state them very well..I mean it's fine to use complex arguments but if you don't know how to say em.....
L: well, their main problem was that they were too busy creating solutions and not arguing why we should control population in the world. I mean, half the paper was, they didn't even, I don't think they even gave much thought to the opposing view that
V: yeah
L: they said, population growth is a serious problem. And they went about ways of solving it. They didn't even give the opposing views that maybe population growth isn't a serious problem. They just //went
V: //automatically assumed ahead
L: gave solutions and spent most of the paper giving solutions out. Which totally threw me off because we're talking, the first one started out like kind of an issue I thought, which, was good. They gave their view points and they were also laying in order like, assuming and then, they offer suggestions of solving a problem that they established was a problem.
Y: hmmm
L: plus, it did not have all 10 sources, so, automatically it drops to the list
V: they have 2.
Y: I thought one problem with all three of these papers is that they ah,...to get 10 pages they kind of rambled a little bit.
R: rambles good
V: that's understandable in a paper of this magnitude, though.
R: yeah.
L: it didn't really, I mean, she said it didn't have to be 10 pages, so, it shouldn't, I mean, they were all
Y: I guess but I thought that was a problem and that's why they were hard to read all three of them.
V: just about any article you read now-a-days though, they ramble.
L: all of these //averaged 6 to 7 pages
Y: //that's bad writing then
L: so, that's, I don't think they really tried to get the 10 pages..6 or 7 pages.
Y: but they still rambled, I mean, they were all hard to read.....
L: they rambled.
V: rambled.
L: plus this one, the spotted owl paper all assumed that he was correct. They were not consistent even in their use of MLA internal citation.
V: yeah.
L: cuz there are some of them where they have the commas, ...in em..and a few//and then there's some
Y: //but that's just minor
L: that is not minor.
V: that's what I meant when I said it was grammatically challenged.
L: but when we're, when we're ranking them, if any little difference, I mean any little mistake makes a difference, when we're ranking them. That's right there.
V: They're gonna lose points on every single one of those unless it's fixed.
L: I think that's why this one, the censoring one, should come ahead of the spotted owl.
V: that was written grammatically well, yeah, I agree....... 
L: so, our final,
Y: conclusion
L: is that censoring is first, spotted owl is second, and what about population or, control of population growth is last.
R: far last.
End task two. Counter at 171.